The Forum

APRIL, 1894.

MR. CLEVELAND'S — FAILURE?

MR. CLEVELAND was elected President a second time because of the long-sighted courage he had shown during his first term, and he was elected by so large a majority that he could have spared the votes of New York. This was an election that changed the party-map of the Union. The Democrats elected 218 members of the House out of 356, and their party had a majority in the Senate. Men said, "This is a revolution." Surely it was the decree of a revolution; for, as was said at the time, the Democratic programme was nothing less than a programme "for the conquest of the world." The world henceforth will belong to those who can sell the best things cheapest. The citizens of the United States can grow and make and carry the great staples more cheaply and in greater quantities than it has been possible ever before for them to be grown or made or carried. As soon as the radical reformation of our fiscal system so as to permit the growing and the making and the carrying of these staples to every part of the earth under the freest conditions should be accomplished, having the wheat-fields, the corn-fields, the cotton-fields that are the best cultivated in the world, and having the coal that is the most cheaply mined and the iron that is the best wrought and cast, because they are mined and wrought and cast by the most intelligent labor and the best machinery, we were quickly to conquer the earth.

The protective tariff-system had been persistently debated for seven years—seven years of prosperity, too, under the protective system, so that "hard times" did not cause the great victory; and the tariff-reform party won on the merits of its programme. Since Mr. Cleveland stood for this one great principle, and since this one great

Copyright, 1893, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle had been proclaimed for so long a time by the leaders of the party everywhere with increasing earnestness and concentration, men of all parties agreed that this election was an emphatic command of the people to reduce the tariff and to rob it of its protective features. If this was not so, a popular vote has no meaning. If this was not what the people meant, they can never mean anything by a popular vote. For months after the election there was no difference of opinion about its meaning.

Nor had there been a President since Washington, who went into office with so clear a purpose,—a purpose that he had himself formulated for the people,—nor so free from personal, factional, or sectional obligations, as Mr. Cleveland. He could say, he did say, and it was said many times in his presence, that he owed his election to no one, but to the whole people. It was his second term of office. He was relieved forever of the temptation, which no President during his first term has withstood, of shaping his conduct for a re-election. He had had experience in the office; and, better yet, he had had the benefit for four years, after his own Presidential experience, of observing the mistakes of another President. Surely no great party in our whole history had ever had so great a triumph under circumstances so happy, nor a great task before it so clearly laid out, so universally understood. Its very enemies were acquiescent. Democrats felt on March 4, 1893, that it was a day of historic importance. Their party had come into power for a long period, perhaps as long as most men then alive should live, and their mood was heroic. At no time within easy memory was the political tone pitched higher. Even criticism and ridicule were for a time silenced.

This was but a year ago. If a national election were to be held to-morrow, no shrewd observer doubts that the Democrats would be defeated in every Northern State and perhaps in more than one Southern State. The Democratic Senate is at war with the Democratic President. The President is weary and vexed. His great party is divided. Congress has passed a bill to "coin a vacuum"—a Democratic measure that he must veto. The one great duty of the party has indeed been done, in a fashion, by the House; but what the House has done is now, to the unspeakable weariness of the people, being undone to a degree by the Senate. A feeling very nearly akin to disgust is everywhere expressed with the Administration and with Congress.

What has happened within a year to bring about so great a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change? Are popular majorities so fickle that they cannot keep their own minds for a twelvemonth? Or has Mr. Cleveland or his party failed?

At the very outset a singular weakness of the President displayed itself. Mr. Cleveland is remarkably strong as the leader of a great party in the opposition. He is not correspondingly strong as the Executive of a victorious party. In one rôle he is heroic, in the other commonplace. He deals masterfully with men in large masses; ineffectually with individuals. Throughout his career he has stood firm, for instance, in his declarations, and no doubt in his purpose, in favor of civil-service reform, but over and over again he has selected men who have put his principles to shame. Surely he has stood unflinchingly for tariff-reform. But he has been unable to win the loyalty of many of the leaders of his party as he won the loyalty of the party itself. On the side of sound finance he has been immovable. But almost within his own household the old heresy of fiat money has lurked, and an unsound financial measure has been passed by his own party.

At the very beginning, therefore, when Mr. Cleveland came to deal with men as individuals, he began to dampen the popular enthusiasm that he had aroused—a popular enthusiasm so strong that it might have been trusted, if used aright, to smother his enemies forever. This enthusiasm began to wane as soon as his Cabinet was announced. Consider, for example, the appointment that he made as Secretary of War. Would it ever have entered into the mind of any man but Mr. Cleveland, at any moment of his life, to appoint Mr. Lamont Secretary of War? In this appointment there was no proper sense of proportion, no appreciation of political perspective. Why, men asked, should Mr. Lamont be Secretary of War? Why not Secretary of anything else? Is he a soldier? a student of military subjects? a commanding figure in our national life? Here came a revelation of the commonplace. To this day nobody thinks of Mr. Lamont as Secretary of War. He is forever fixed in the public mind only as Mr. Cleveland's own secretary; and whatever be his talents or achievements, as Mr. Cleveland's own secretary he will remain fixed in the public mind. Moreover, such an appointment, in spite of Mr. Lamont's personal popularity, did violence not only to the popular imagination, but to the theory of Cabinet-making, and the appointment of Mr. Gresham was as quixotic as the appointment of Mr. Lamont was absurd. Grotesque, too, was the effect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of assigning the strongest personality in the Cabinet to the least important post.

Thus, as soon as Mr. Cleveland began to make appointments, the high political tone of March 4 began to fall. Nothing is so dispiriting as the feeling that a great opportunity may be passing unused. And now for a time there was hardly even talk of fiscal reform. The President was advised to call Congress in extraordinary session to set about the work at once. The answer was, Let us first get the Administration organized. The Democratic disreputables swarmed to the capital; nor did they swarm in vain. The Democratic bosses who had been retired during the campaign saw the opportunity and seized it. While the Administration was getting itself organized, they grew bold again. This was the first grave mistake that Mr. Cleveland made—in giving them this opportunity. It was an extraordinary occasion if ever an extraordinary occasion came, and Congress ought to have begun its great task before it could have been distracted from it. By delay, time was given, too, to the enemies of tariff reform to take new courage and to make new efforts. By the time the Wilson Bill came finally into the Senate they had made the most formidable organization, as well as the most insidious, that they had ever had. They had found opportunities to plead and to trade. They had devised new methods to produce theatrical effects, and they had found out all the weak places in the Democratic column—from coal and sugar to collars and cuffs.

And so the summer, big with approaching commercial disaster, came on. And commercial disaster following the Administration's delay muddled many a man whose head had before been clear. Every rural member of Congress who had ever dallied with fiat money now embraced it; so that when the President was obliged to call Congress in extraordinary session to repeal the silver-purchase clause of the act of 1890, a Congress assembled that had forgotten for the time its duty to reform the tariff, but was secretly in favor of free silver! No popular enthusiasm could withstand this revelation.

Now it was that the stubborn characteristics—which, since they were successful, we must in fairness call the heroic characteristics—of Mr. Cleveland again asserted themselves; and he did one of the most conspicious public services that stand to the credit of any of our statesmen. Here was a Congress of his own party besotted with ignorance of the fundamental facts about finance, fanatical, unreasoning, believing a lie. Here was a statute that the opposite party had put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the books, which was fast bringing commercial ruin and threatening national bankruptcy; and here was a government-deficit clearly in sight. One would have thought that the Democratic party, if it had seen nothing else, would have seen the party advantage of restoring credit that had been shaken by Republican legislation and Republican extravagance. But it did not. Moreover here was a Secretary of the Treasury some of whose past financial notions were disquieting; here was a Vice-President whose accession to the Presidency just then would have precipitated such a panic as our commerce has seldom known; and here was a Senate part of which was senile, and part of which was but personified vested interests in silver.

With all these difficulties in the way, Mr. Cleveland forced the repeal of the purchasing-clause of the silver act; for it was he that did it. He alone stood between the country and disaster. Never in a time of peace was better service done by any President. Again he rose to the highest level. Again he made a chapter in our history that will be recalled after all the other actors in it are forgotten.

By this time many timid people, forgetful of their mood of the year before, were asking themselves if it were not better to abandon tariff-reform for the present. But again, it must be recalled, Mr. Cleveland rose to the occasion. After the repeal of the silver-purchase law, the commercial disasters of the summer did not cause him to waver in the slightest degree, and his message recommending the reform of the tariff contained the same true ring as his more famous message of 1887. But the popular enthusiasm was gone, partly because there was an absurdity in entrusting the reformation of the tariff to a Congress that was secretly in favor of an unsound currency, but partly also because of a very general desire that nothing further should be done to create uncertainty in the commercial and industrial world.

The Hawaiian trouble, a disreputable inheritance from the preceding Administration, was drawing its slow length along. An opportunity was given to Mr. Cleveland to select the wrong man as Minister to the Hawaiian Government, and he appointed the estimable but undiplomatic Mr. Willis. Here again Mr. Cleveland, while right himself in his contention, chose the wrong man for a delicate task, and the prevalent feeling everywhere to-day is that the Hawaiian affair was awkwardly managed. As regards our foreign service in general, there have, of course, been not a few good appointments; but all round the world at our consular posts are men that were selected by a most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

infelicitous reformer because they were unfit. If they were not selected for their unfitness, for what reason were they selected? The explanation of unfitness covers more of these phenomena than any other explanation, and is therefore scientific. Mr. Cleveland himself, whom public opinion has to a great extent excused for the sins of his subordinates, has always had a strange way of picking up men,—not impulsively, for he is not a man of impulses, but quixotically. In the early days of the present Administration an application was made for a minor consulship by an unsuccessful young lawyer from a strong Democratic State, and the applicant came to Washington hoping to get an interview with the President. One of the Senators from his State, a man of a certain frayed-out dignity, who eight years before had imposed on Mr. Cleveland in similar ways, made an appointment with the President to introduce his young friend. So fulsome was the Senator's praise of his candidate that Mr. Cleveland straightway appointed him, not to a minor consulship, but to one of the most important posts in the consular service,—to the profound astonishment of the Senator, who frankly remarked to his intimates afterward that he had "overdone the job."

Stories more or less like this any man with a political acquaintance more or less constantly hears, and unfortunately too many of them are true. They show the essentially commonplace, uninspiring side of the President's character. A very shrewd observer once remarked that it was difficult to understand, while you were talking with Mr. Hayes, how at a distance you were obliged to feel that he was so weak a President; and that it was equally difficult, while you were talking with Mr. Cleveland, to understand how at a distance he seemed so strong a President. It is in dealing at a distance and with large masses of men and with public opinion that Mr. Cleveland is strongest; and he is weakest when he deals with men near at hand and with individuals, or with individual opinion.

By reason of this characteristic, the second and perhaps the greatest misfortune of his Administration has come. He has permitted his old enemies in New York—the Democratic machine—to continue to dominate the party—or at least to have good hope of doing so. The Democratic machine in New York has an artificial and greatly exaggerated importance. As it is, and as it has been for the greater part of the last twenty years or more, it is not a political party at all. It is simply the semi-criminal oligarchy that rules the cities. Since our municipal government is the most lucrative part of our government,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is, of course, the most corrupt. Bad as the results of such misrule have been in New York city, in Brooklyn, in Buffalo, and in Troy, the internal, local results have by no means been the worst; for these machines, through their control of the cities, got control of the State of New York. Nor is this the worst. The plunder of cities and the degradation of a State are bad results of the decline of civic activity in New York; but even these are not the worst results. These business-like organizations of plunderers call themselves Democrats, and the ignorant Democrats in other States regard them as Democrats and receive them into political fellowship. So long as this oligarchy is regarded as a Democratic organization it will pull down the National Democratic party to its own level. The burden of Tammany and the so-called "regular" Democratic organization in New York is almost as great a burden on the National Democratic party as slavery was a generation ago.

Now it is not the duty of a President of the United States to concern himself with local party troubles. But when there is such a party burden as is sure to wreck his party and to thwart the very purpose of its existence, if he do not pay heed to it, how can he expect to have his party do any high duty? The cause of tariff-reform, the cause of civil-service reform, the dignity, integrity, and cleanliness, the very existence, in fact, of the Democratic party, require its emancipation from the New York State machine. Mr. Cleveland could have done much more than he has done to accomplish this emancipation. Every triumph that he has won has been won by reason of his hostility to this machine and by reason of the popular hope of his continued hostility. It is not a mere local factional fight. It is a struggle to the death. If Hill and Murphy and their like are the Democratic party, the Democratic party cannot survive. No man can doubt this except the man who doubts the success of our whole system of popular government.

Now what has happened within this twelvemonth is this: the tone of the Democratic party has slid down from the level of the heroic mood of the whole people to the level of the New York machine, which is to-day giving its influence to the protectionists in the Senate in return for votes that have been given to punish Mr. Cleveland. The Supreme Court, tariff-reform, the national welfare,—what are these to Hill and Murphy? I suppose that the most contemptible figure ever cut in public life since any part of the world became civilized is the figure cut by a Democratic senator from New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working might and main in the United States Senate to increase the duty on collars and cuffs by 5 per cent. He has succeeded, too, at least in committee. It cannot be forgotten that Mr. Cleveland might have prevented the election of Murphy as Senator; nor can it be forgotten that since Murphy's election he has managed the situation ill.

It was and is the bounden duty of Mr. Cleveland, if he have (and he has) the great principles of his party in his keeping, to make sure that that party, if it is to be the instrument of these reforms, shall not fall to the level of these mercenary local organizations for the plunder of cities. Who were the Democrats most in the popular mind a year ago? They were Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Fairchild in New York, Mr. Russell in Massachusetts, Mr. Morton in Nebraska, Mr. Smith in Georgia, and men like these. But now the men who are most active as Democrats are Mr. Hill and Mr. Murphy in New York, Mr. Gorman in Maryland, Mr. Bland in Missouri, Mr. McPherson in New Jersey, Mr. Brice in Ohio. Every great social and political subject must at last be measured by individuals. If the Democratic party of a year ago and the Democratic party to-day be measured by these two groups of men, we have a very accurate index of its decline. So noticeable is this decline that every political student who goes to Washington at intervals feels the difference in the atmosphere and in the talk, then and now. The topics of conversation then were the triumph of a great principle, the wisdom of the people in the long run, the wide opportunity, the long lease of Democratic power. Now the topics one hears are of iron interests and sugar certificates, the "fight" between the President and the Senate, the "deals" and "dickers" and little cliques: the most dismal commonplaces in the whole vocabulary of crime are these commonplaces of so-called "practical politics." Indeed nothing in contemporaneous life is more depressing than a visit now to Washington. Soon after the Civil War a facetious ex-Confederate general declared that on his way to New York he always took a route that led around Washington. "I do not care to be either bored or corrupted," he used to say. Many an independent voter whose hopes were high a year ago will appreciate his feeling.

But the responsibility of keeping his party up to the level where it can hold the public confidence does not rest alone on Mr. Cleveland. The Senate is even more to blame. Since it became Democratic it has sunk to a lower level than ever before. It was the greatest menace to sound money, and it is the greatest menace to tariff-reform. A

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considerable number of Democratic senators, it seems, wish the municipal plunderers who call themselves Democrats to rule their party. This means that the degradation of our great municipalities is to effect the degradation of the National government as well. Hitherto we have been able to say that our system of government has on the whole worked well in State and National affairs and has broken down utterly only in our cities. But the events of the past year at Washington give reason to fear that municipal corruption is really the strongest force in our National political life. We might as well see the consequences of domination by Hill and Murphy and Gorman clearly in the beginning. The Democratic party cannot survive this domination; or, if it survive it and conquer, free government cannot survive. The same question that has for thirty years put the Democratic party on the defensive again thrusts itself forward,—Can it so keep down its own corrupt and ignorant elements as to be entrusted with power?

The House of Representatives has to a degree done its duty. The putting of wool and iron ore on the free-list, if they are at last put there, will be an historic event. But this is going at furthest but a little way; and if the Republican party had leaders that were not stone-blind they would yet take the one great duty of the time in hand, reform the tariff better than the professional tariff-reformers seem likely to do it, turn themselves to the task of municipal reform, on which every other problem seems more and more likely to turn at last, and take a new lease of life and power; for it is yet very doubtful whether the Democratic party will succeed.

Mr. Cleveland's achievement in bringing a long discredited party into power and up to the level of a great expectation was herculean. Its sliding back in one year was to a degree inevitable, but it has gone backward to a greater degree than could have been predicted—in great measure surely by reason of his two chief mistakes, his tardiness in getting to the actual work of tariff-reform, and his neglect of the state of politics in New York. He has proved himself a very great leader in a large struggle for supremacy; but in the work of doing the task that he himself formulated he cannot even choose good tools. He lacks imagination. He is a plodding man. He cannot see dramatic effects. He cannot play the game of statecraft when the time comes for him to move men on the board. He cannot measure the effect of individualities on public opinion. He is like Jefferson in his clear discernment of great principles and in his knowl-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edge just when to proclaim them with supreme effect. But he has almost the stolid density of his immediate predecessor when he comes to the task of working them out. Not the least instructive lesson of Lincoln's career is that a really great Executive must be a man of imagination, even of humor, if possible a man also of personal charm. These qualities of imagination and personal "magnetism" have in our own time carried through a long political career, brilliant if empty, a man who had no principles whatever. These qualities are by no means substitutes for the sterling virtues that Mr. Cleveland has. But they are necessary qualities nevertheless for a great President. It is a very proper demand that a democracy makes, that its enthusiasm shall be kept aglow even while its most tedious tasks are in hand. Else at best a President or a party becomes but a poor drudge. In a hand-to-hand encounter Mr. Cleveland's enemies get the better of him,—the same enemies that on a larger field he has time and again utterly routed. When the President becomes a drudge, so commonplace becomes even the high duty of the hour that popular enthusiasm wanes and the sorriest rogue can for a time play the rôle of a hero. So strut now Hill and Gorman. To this extent the President has failed.

But this much is certain—Mr. Cleveland is the only man now in our public life who has made a chapter in our political history that men of the next generation will recall; and he yet has time before his final retirement to show whether he has the same mastery as an executive that he has as a political leader. He is reported lately to have said to several of his friends that he made a mistake in becoming President again. He is weary, vexed, even angry. What wonder? If he will but fight as well in a close struggle as he has fought in an open field, the people will in due time scourge the Senate as they scourged the "billion-dollar" Congress under his inspiration. The question is, whether the representatives of vested interests and the corrupters of municipal politics in the Senate shall be permitted to thwart the great fiscal revolution of 1892 decreed by the people to bring about our political and industrial emancipation. There is no disguising the grave danger that Mr. Cleveland and his party may fail and leave this great task to be done by the very men who decry them.

"AN INDEPENDENT."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LORD ROSEBERY AND THE LIBERAL CRISIS IN ENGLAND.

THE new Prime Minister of Great Britain is undoubtedly a remarkable man. In English politics, any age under fifty is comparative youthfulness, yet Lord Rosebery at forty-six succeeds, as leader of the Liberal party, a veteran who was fighting its battles long before his successor was born. Reared amid aristocratic surroundings; growing up in political life apart from the vigorous struggles of the House of Commons; habituated to the customs of high position, the respect still given to hereditary rank, and the exercise of that power which immense wealth gives its possessor, he takes the helm of State as the democratic leader of a party which is pledged to wholesale measures of reform. Twice Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in a Liberal Cabinet, he has succeeded in changing the entire tendency of his party policy; he has proclaimed the necessity of continuity in the treatment of external affairs; he has impressed himself upon the statesmen of Europe as a strong man of wide views and great determination; and he has acquired a degree of popular confidence in this direction which makes even Conservatives look upon him as a sort of national sheet-anchor which prevents the state from drifting to ruin under Liberal guidance.

Lord Rosebery seems to have been successful in attaining almost everything that he has ever desired. Twenty years ago he was comparatively poor. In 1878 he married the daughter of Baron Meyer de Rothschild and became one of the richest men in England. The wealth that he had freely enjoyed during Lady Rosebery's lifetime became entirely his at her death in 1890. His first speech in the House of Lords in 1871 brought him many encomiums and appointments to several positions of importance. His Presidency of the Social Science Congress in 1874 resulted in an address which, to the astonishment of all who knew him as a young man of only twenty-seven, was published in the "Times" next day to the extent of some six columns. His fluency, wit, sound reasoning, pleasant delivery, and attractive style early brought him a reputation as a speaker which has been steadily growing. His visits to Australia and to Canada,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coupled with a consistent advocacy of closer Imperial relations and continuous expressions of affection and praise for the Colonies, have made him popular in every part of the external empire. His success as Foreign Secretary during two brief terms has been demonstrated in the progress and peace of Egypt; the management of the Siamese question; the generally high place now taken by England in foreign consideration; the passiveness of Russia; the peace of Europe. His administration of affairs in the London County Council not only brought him into contact with the people and made the establishment of that great legislative and democratic body a success, but it proved him to possess in the highest degree tact, industry, and administrative ability. His monograph upon the life of Pitt shows him capable of taking a very high place in literature. His handling of the delicate labor problems and social questions of the day could not have been shown to greater effect or in a more valuable way than in the really wonderful manner in which he arbitrated the differences and soothed the ill-feelings between masters and men in the recent mining strike.

He has now attained the highest position in the gift of the sovereign—as representing the popular will. He had already won the blue-ribbon of the turf—the Derby, and the blue-ribbon of knighthood—the Garter. He had married the greatest heiress in England; he has controlled the foreign affairs of his country and empire; he has now succeeded the greatest leader in modern English history. Obstacles to future success and even the maintenance of present power, he will have in abundance; but the tact which has carried him through many difficulties should now come into operation in a far loftier sphere. If a curious facility in triumphing over rivals is any criterion, he should succeed. Had the split in the party during 1885 not occurred, he would probably have had to give way at this juncture to either Joseph Chamberlain or the Duke of Devonshire. Had not another cause removed Sir Charles Dilke from his path, that brilliant and popular Radical would have been well in the race for the Premiership. Had Earl Spencer's health not given way, he might have been a formidable candidate. But after the collapse of Sir William Vernon Harcourt's still more powerful pretensions to the position, Lord Spencer's claim, except as a compromise, need hardly be considered. Yet, eleven years ago, Lord Rosebery had to resign a minor part in the Ministry because the present Chancellor of the Exchequer objected to its being held by a peer.

At the present time Lord Rosebery's views upon various public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions are widely debated. Are his opinions really democratic? Will he move against the House of Lords? Is Home Rule likely to remain a chief plank in the party platform? Can he hold the Liberal, Radical, and Irish sections together? But the past will throw some reliable light upon the present in this as in many other cases. To clear the way, it may be said that there is nothing very curious in a Peer becoming Premier of Great Britain. And the fact of his being a member of the Upper House need not injure, but rather aid Lord Rosebery in any conflicts which may arise between the two Chambers. Lord Grey did not find his position an inconvenience in forcing the Reform Bill of 1832 through the Lords, nor did Lord Derby in 1867 find it anything but an aid in facilitating the passage of Disraeli's franchise reform in that year. Lord Melbourne was an aristocrat to the finger-tips, yet he made a reasonably popular Liberal leader. So with the Earl of Aberdeen. Lord Palmerston escaped the House of Lords only by being an Irish peer, but he was none the less a powerful Premier for being a nobleman in every sense of the word. Pitt and Canning, Peel and Gladstone have preferred the Commons, it is true; but the career of Lord Beaconsfield proves that in England a leader may sit in both Houses and yet be a successful statesman.

The new Premier is a widely popular man. Like Mr. Gladstone he is popular with the masses. Like Lord Salisbury he is admired by the classes. The most democratic section of the United Kingdom is Scotland, and it is there that Lord Rosebery commands the largest comparative following. The most democratic public body in England is the London County Council, and there he commands the closest attention and the sincerest regard and respect. He frequently expresses his belief in democracy and his adherence to its principles, but never in an aggressive or violent form. In May, 1892, speaking to an immense audience in Edinburgh, he pointed out that British history showed first the predominance of the monarchy, then the predominance of the aristocracy, then of the middle classes, and now, by the increase of the franchise, had come practically the predominance of the laboring classes.

"Our democracy is not a pure democracy, but it demands that it shall be recognized as a democracy, and that, as you have established a democracy, you shall frankly recognize the fact that your government, springing from the people as it does, must be for and by and on behalf of the people."

Then he spoke of the necessity of change, of experimental legislation in the direction of bringing about "a better and more favorable share

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the land, better and more sanitary houses, better air-spaces, shorter hours of labor."

He has taken practical steps in the road of reform. The equipment of the People's Palace in London, the removal of religious disabilities, the improvement of dwellings by the "Artisans' Dwelling Act," the efficient work done by the London County Council, under his direction, in bettering the conditions which surround the every-day workingman in the crowded streets of the capital, are sign-posts along the path he has taken.

Lord Rosebery has complete confidence in the people. Speaking at Kelso, Scotland, on June 16, 1892, he declared:

> "I have unlimited faith in the good sense, the wisdom, and the justice of the great mass of our population—trained as they have been by centuries of the exercise of political freedom, and by many years of the political vote, and therefore I for one shall never be disposed to use the language of melancholy and foreboding at any particular crisis of our country's fate."

And he went on to say that the question of Local Government was the vital one of the period—"small councils, parish councils, in which every man can feel that he has an interest," being an all-important part of the national problems.

While, however, we may fairly consider Lord Rosebery as democratic in his views, it must be said that his democracy is more akin to that of Mr. Chamberlain than to that of Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Healy, or Mr. Redmond. He is a thoroughgoing Imperialist—what the editor of "Truth" calls a "Jingo." He believes in a strong navy, in the retention of every atom of British soil, the formation of a closer relationship between the Colonies and England, the extension of the empire as in the cases of Uganda and Egypt. Even the cession of Heligoland was distasteful to him, and in a speech delivered at the time he stated that if in the future any British administration dared even to consider the separation of Canada or Australia from the Empire "it would be damned by the whole British nation." The extreme Radical school, though small in numbers, is violent in language and does not at all like this Imperial feeling. It is this which really causes their hostility to the new Premier. They are the remnants of the once powerfully organized sentiment which swept over England in the seventies, and declared, through the medium of Mr. Bright's eloquence and Mr. Goldwin Smith's pen, that the Colonies could go, and the sooner the better. But that feeling has changed, and Lord Rosebery embodies the Liberal reaction. From this standpoint his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accession to power is very important. It makes the two parties practically one upon the question of imperial unity.

Lord Rosebery has never been a blind partisan of the House of Lords, nor has he ever attacked them with anything but mild and respectful comments. In speaking to his famous motion on June 20, 1884, which urged the appointment of a Committee to "consider the best means of promoting the efficiency of this House," he plainly expressed his opinions. The whole speech pointed to mending rather than ending; and though ten years of storm and stress have passed since then, there is no reason to believe that his sympathies are not the same as ever. But he hinted then that action might be too long delayed,

> "The voices from without demanded both revision and improvement, but he should never have asked their Lordships to appoint a Committee from fear of abolition. If no higher motive would induce their Lordships to consider the matter, he should say that reform had come too late. Bodies that began to reform themselves when the hand of the destroyer was upon them did not live to complete the task. It would be too late to move for any Select Committee when the voice which called for radical reform became loud and universal."

He will now have to judge whether that time has come, and to declare if what he then said is applicable to the present situation. His speech was received with respect, but was hardly considered by the Lords. Yet the reforms asked for were simple enough. He wanted the quorum increased to forty, as in the House of Commons. He asked that, instead of spending a barren six months in each session and winding up with a fruitful fortnight, more legislation should be initiated and business better managed. He wanted a Joint Committee of the two Houses in order to "reduce the inanition of the one House and relieve the congestion of the other by an amicable allocation of measures between the two." He desired to remedy the sudden swamping of regular attendants in the House by the influx, upon important occasions, of habitual absentees. And he would like to have enlarged the list of life peers so as to bring in representatives of every class and section. There were, he pointed out, already twenty-seven eminent divines in the persons of the Bishops sitting in the Lords. There were twenty-four peers who were or had been Cabinet Ministers; four who were, or had been, ambassadors; six who were or had been governors-general; ten great and distinguished lawyers; forty admirals, generals, and ex-Ministers of lower than Cabinet rank; and there was the poet laureate. Altogether there were 116 individuals whom any second chamber in the world might be proud to boast as members.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But why not add representatives of medicine, of literature, of commerce and business, of the Colonies, and of labor?

This last proposition provoked a laugh, but in days when a laboring man like Henry Broadhurst could be in the Ministry, and Tom Mann could, without rebuke, address the present Premier at a public meeting as "Citizen Rosebery," it is probable that the speaker was wiser than his amused auditors. And Lord Rosebery told the House of Lords plainly that "he believed it was neither so popular as its friends said, nor so unpopular as its enemies made out." He very likely holds the same view to-day, and in all probability will counsel moderation and conciliation. He believed then that the House of Lords wanted—

—"a new infusion of the ideas of other classes, new representatives, new sources of information, . . . a larger infusion from those large classes among whom is to be found so much of the wealth and power of the country."

His policy then was: "as regards the individuals, greater responsibility; as regards the body, the broadening of its foundations and the enlargement of the scope of its opportunities." Non-intervention in the recent debates upon the Parish Councils bill, and the fact that he has expressed no opinion regarding Mr. Gladstone's attack upon the Lords, leave him at this juncture with a free hand. If, therefore, action is taken, it seems probable that it will be in the direction of reform, and not abolition. And expressions more than once repeated in his Life of Pitt and elsewhere lead to the impression that Lord Rosebery favors the right being given Peers to be elected to the Commons. It would undoubtedly strengthen the Upper House, and the influence of the peerage would certainly be very pleasant to Lord Rosebery personally. At the same time a system of delegation from the English peerage might be adopted, as is the case in Scotland, by which its representative men only would become members of the House of Lords. Some such reforms are possible; abolition is not in the least degree likely so long as men like Rosebery lead the Liberal party.

Lord Rosebery is a supporter of Home Rule. There can be no doubt of that fact. But the tenor of his speeches—and they are not very numerous upon the subject—prove him to be a calm, reasoning advocate of the idea, willing to give and take in all details, but desirous in a general way of ensuring the success of local self-government as a principle applicable to Ireland. Still he is not an enthusiast upon the subject. The policy he considers a leap toward the light; the principle of governing through the properly ascertained

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wishes of the Irish people as much settled as is Magna Charta; the result one of assured prosperity. "If," said he in the great debate of last fall, "you set Ireland afloat across the Atlantic until it reached the shores of America, within ten years she would be as prosperous as any other State of the Union." But his idea of Home Rule seems very different from that of Mr. Gladstone. With Mr. Gladstone, Home Rule was the end which he wished to attain with all his heart and all his power. With Lord Rosebery it seems but as a means to an end. In the course of his Kelso speech already quoted he observed:

"I believe that this is a question of Empire in its broadest and widest shape, because, as you know, our Empire rests on Home Rule, and without Home Rule it could not continue to exist a moment."

And he proceeded to make a statement which seems of such importance at the present juncture that it is worthy of full quotation:

"If I was a great statesman like Lord Salisbury, I should give not merely Home Rule to Ireland, but I should seize that opportunity, in giving Home Rule to Ireland, to give an additional cement to the fabric of our Empire. You will have, as I believe, to frame a tribunal in which disputed cases under the settlement with Ireland may be referred. Now is the time to organize a great Imperial tribunal, a Supreme Court of Appeal of the Empire, to which you should add Irish judges, to which you should add Colonial judges, to which you should add Indian judges, and which, by deciding disputes between the Empire and its dependent States, and between State and State, and between individual and State, shall rival the majesty of the Supreme Court of the United States. . . . I believe the settlement with Ireland will give us the opportunity of making a new cement for our Empire by the erection of some such tribunal."

Such an utterance is of great interest at this time. To the Colonies it is of importance as coming from the late President of the Imperial Federation League; the nobleman who declared at Leeds in 1889 that the policy called by that name was one for which an Englishman "might well live and, if needs be, die." It is of importance as showing the tendency which the new Premier has of looking at everything in its widest aspect, and of considering the Colonies in applying domestic policy as well as in dealing with those foreign affairs which he recently summarized as being comprised in one word "Empire," instead of the old-time formula, "Europe." It is of interest in the American Republic as showing the close study he has made of its institutions, and his willingness to copy some of them. It is of importance in England as indicating his preference for the federal idea over Mr. Gladstone's principle of applying local government to England or Scotland or Ireland only as it is demanded. He has already declared himself favorable to Home Rule for Scotland; and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federal Supreme Court means practically the application of federalism as a principle to the entire constitution of the British Empire.

For Home Rule solely as an Irish question, therefore, Lord Rosebery may not be particularly enthusiastic. In fact he distinctly said so in the House of Lords on September 7, 1893:

> "I speak as a witness, but not as an enthusiastic witness, in favor of Home Rule. With me, at any rate, Home Rule is not a fanaticism, scarcely even a question of discipline; it is not a question of perfection, but it is on the whole the best of the courses to adopt in dealing with a highly critical situation. It is with me a question of policy."

He even joked over the whole matter and declared amid laughter that he "was not certain about anything with regard to Ireland." And he asked the House, though in vain, to arrange for some discussion of a possible compromise. All this goes to show that Lord Rosebery will not strain the Constitution, or injure the vital unity of Great Britain and Ireland, in an effort to carry out Mr. Gladstone's policy. But by every effort of modification, conciliation, and rearrangement, he will probably try to evolve a satisfactory settlement of the vexed question.

And now, as to the last of the current inquiries: Can he hold the elements of his party together? In attempting any answer to this proposition it is as well in the first place to put Mr. Labouchere where he properly belongs. He is not, in brief, a man of any great influence in England, nor has he any steady following or even the qualities which might create and maintain a following. He is the least of the difficulties which Lord Rosebery has to encounter. The Irish members of both divisions constitute a considerable danger. But, after all, what can they do? To force a dissolution against the will and policy of the Liberal leader would effectually wreck Home Rule. To try and supersede Lord Rosebery is equally out of the question. The only man who could pretend to take his place at this time is Sir William Harcourt, and any one who appreciates his ambition knows that if there had been any hope whatever of his holding the party together, he would have already forced the running instead of accepting the leadership of the Commons and serving under a member of the Lords. There is no one else in the Liberal ranks sufficiently prominent to take the mantle of Gladstone. And if any question comes up upon which Mr. Labouchere, a few Radicals, and some of the Irish members should decide to vote against the Government, it is not unlikely that the Liberal-Unionists would support Lord Rosebery. His well-known Imperialism, his antipathy to separation in any form,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his lack of enthusiasm for Gladstonian Home Rule, his management of foreign affairs, would all be factors in his favor at such a moment. And even if he were defeated in the House, they would tell strongly in the country, where the great Conservative argument against Home Rule is the possibility of its resulting in disunion and practical separation.

Perhaps a more important difficulty than any named is the utter lack of sympathy between himself and Sir William Harcourt. In this connection a significant extract may be given from Lord Rosebery's monograph upon Pitt:

"But between a Prime Minister in the House of Lords and the leader of the House of Commons, confidence is indispensable. Responsibility rests so largely with the one, and articulation so greatly with the other, that unity of sentiment is the one necessary link that makes a relation—in any case difficult—in any way possible. The voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau may effect a successful imposture, but can hardly constitute a durable administration."

So far as can be judged at present, matters may go on quietly for a brief period, but the two leaders can hardly work harmoniously through all the difficulties ahead. And Lord Rosebery is not the man to give way upon any vital point. Still his tact and powers of conciliation may avert trouble until the time of serious danger is past. But if the Government should be wrecked by some side-wind in the House of Commons,—and that is more than possible with such a small majority and with so rash a leader as Sir William Harcourt,—it will be due to the absence of Lord Rosebery from its deliberations, and his consequent inability to control those sudden storms which arise even under the most skilful guidance, sweep members into different lobbies, and carry the Ministry to defeat before either supporters or opponents are aware of the situation. Here lies the danger to the new Premier, and the possibility of a general election before many months. He needs a united party, and it is therefore not unlikely that a dissolution will take place before very long, and Rosebery and Salisbury will appeal to the electorate. Meantime Lord Rosebery's policy in a general way, his principles in broad outline, may be not inadequately portrayed by his own eloquent word at Birmingham on May 26, 1892:

"Never was the power of the British Empire so great as it is now. It stretches away into space, calm with the sleeping strength of a summer sea. But what is the real essence—what is the secret of that power? It is not in fleets or in armies, or even in your treasures or your population. Its essence, its inspiration, its base, is in equal liberty and in equal justice."

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

TORONTO, CANADA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS.

THE heart and life of educational systems has been the course or curriculum which determines both the subjects taught and their order. The matter of a good course ought to be certain, not only worth knowing in itself, but better worth knowing than anything else; condensed enough not to be insipid, and carefully fitted to the dominant interests and needs of the age, and to the nascent stages of youth. The *trivium* and the *quadrivium*, which held their own a thousand years; the *ratio studiorum* of the Jesuits; some monastic rules like that of St. Benedict; the three R's, which have come down from Charlemagne; the courses of the German gymnasium, of the French *lycée*, of the nine great schools of England, which is the old college course of this country,—these pedagogic masterpieces were meant to be compends of the chief culture-material of their day, and in fact did fulfil—some more, some less—the above conditions. The best matured norms of recent years,—the Johns Hopkins "groups," the new "codes" of British and German military schools, and that of the *neue deutsche Schule*, which would shape matter, time, order, and method, are products of a more conscious consensus, and are more like the great creeds than like the ethnic bibles of the race.

An educational course, new or old, elementary or academic, should be a magazine of well-prepared culture. Like healthy blood, or, better, like a *placenta* nourishing the young with the nutritive extracts of many foods, irrigating the roots of piety, national life, and personal virtue with rich, informing streams, it should gather nutriment from all sources and set the heart of youth aglow. It should palpitate with the best that is new or old, should be rich in those hints, glimpses, and enthusiasms which mark the early segmentation of the soul, and should appeal, not to a precocious exactness, but to that nine-tenths of the soul that can be stirred deeply only if dimly into sympathetic vibration with it. The matter of a good course of study should be given in the largest possible wholes, and not be macerated by method-cram; it should appeal to spontaneous interest, attention, respect,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather than to the mere carrying-power of an artificial school-bred memory. Such a course, that really appeals to the best sentiments, ideals, endeavors, is as precious as it is hard to make. It is a sort of *viaticum* of the upward pilgrimage of the soul, thridding the maze of knowledges and skills, shortening and epitomizing the progress of human development, as ontogeny epitomizes phylogeny, and giving a stable basis to all human institutions.

All courses, however, are liable to defects, and even to diseases, and, without eternal vigilance, inevitably tend, always and everywhere, to decay. Lapse to mechanism and routine is the iron law of all educational systems and is as universal as gravity. The *morbus pedagogicus* forever puts the letter above the spirit, and moves in a realm of definition, methods, cram, marks. We can always find in colleges and schools about us the culture equivalents of the sophists, pharisees, and scholastics. Courses have sometimes grown so rigidly orthodox and exclusive as to approach the esoteric rites and mysteries of savage tribes into which youth are gradually initiated. "Finishing" courses have left the world's great questions closed instead of open, by inoculating against deeper love of knowledge with an attenuated culture, so that when the curriculum is completed there is an almost Faust-like sense of finality and omniscience. Very few, indeed, realize how not only worthless but sterilizing to mind and harmful to both body and morals, educational systems always tend to become before any one knows it.

In France, under the utilitarian tendencies of the Revolution, higher education became so bad that it was practically abolished under the first Napoleon, leaving only technical and professional schools. In Germany, near the beginning of this century, a like step was strongly urged; and what would the world not have lost had such counsel prevailed? In England, universities had sunk to "somnolent predominance" before the reforms which began forty years ago. In Italy it was recently urged that eight of her provincial universities be abolished, so dead and mechanical had they become; while in Spain academic decay has gone so far that a patriotic Spanish professor prayed that Spain might be conquered by a country that had some respect for education. In a word, the history of education is largely the story of this decay and the noble struggles against it.

The inertia that resists change here is enormous. Courses get incrusted by habit till a teacher-machine on the Eli Perkins pattern might be imagined to do the work. Tradition consecrates, legislation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elaborates, the large vested interests of school-supplies tie down, politics entangles, and sometimes endowment isolates; so that it is not strange that reforms are very rare, hard, slow, and often prove in the end far more superficial than was thought; as witness the very slight changes in Latin, and especially in Greek, in German gymnasia, as the result of years of discussion. Wars and revolutions that overturn states and reconstruct society often leave education unchanged in method and matter. Save in Japan, educational history records no complete or radical reconstruction.

The American college was of English origin, coming through Harvard and Yale from Emanuel College, Cambridge, and when the latter was unfortunately in a low state. In the year 1800 we had but eighteen colleges; in 1820–30, seventeen were added; in 1830–40, twenty-eight; in 1840–50, forty; in 1850–60, eighty; in 1860–70, seventy; in 1870–80, sixty-three; in 1880–90, forty-eight. Thus, during the period of its most rapid multiplication, the old American college course, with classics and mathematics during the first two or three years, with morals, religion, history, or other variables, at the end, became strongly intrenched before it was ever seriously questioned. At its best this course was instinct with ideas of discipline and liberal culture. It made no attempt at completeness or to satisfy every form of receptivity. It was not always the way by which scientific progress entered, but it was a bond between high and low; it assumed that most men could do most things; it gave young men the feeling of a larger life, and the blocks of knowledge indicated by its degree had some definite meaning. It introduced the mind rapidly to many fields, gave flexibility and aspiration, and was the mould in which most of the best souls that the New World had yet known were cast. It is no wonder that among the twenty Southern colleges, of which J. H. Dillard writes, which were under the influence of the University of Virginia—modelled by Jefferson after the University of France—fixed courses seem gaining on the original plan of free electives or options.

The introduction of the elective system in the North marks the first great epoch in the advance of higher education. Although not new in principle, and no doubt inevitable, its beneficence cannot be overestimated; and history will chiefly associate it here with the name of one sagacious and energetic leader. Like the Reformation it appealed from a settled system to private judgment, and, by introducing competition, it was almost the first external stimulus felt by pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessors in this country to grow in their office. Reforms which have been usually forced from without now became possible from within. It gave most effective grounds for new appeals for money. Modern studies came to due dignity. Academic careers were opened to youth whose dominant bias was scientific, just as object-lessons and manual methods in lower schools brought up visual- and motor-minded children to their proper level. Currents of popular interest and utility which were in danger of turning away flowed again toward seats of learning. For years this was the leading topic, and institutions slowly came to believe in it almost in proportion as they acquired the means to adopt it. The old college course either took its place beside others or broke up into larger or smaller units of choice,—even groups seeming too large units for President Eliot, who compared them to ready-made clothing. To the rivalry for money and students was added that of courses, which sprang up like sects and creeds under Protestantism, until the critical perspective that can distinguish between Isaiah and Joanna Southcote seemed jeopardized.

To the old A.B. and A.M. there have now been added, according to Mr. Thomas, fifty-three other degrees. In 1888 an eminent professor, who is now the energetic and progressive President of Cornell University, true to the spirit of the founder, who desired an institution where "any person can find instruction in any study," declared that "the steam-engine is as sacred as Greek"; that "philosophy is not more venerable than road-making"; and that a true people's university stands for all subjects alike. At least there has been a hot struggle for survival among many branches and courses. Some have grown "soft," and not a few have failed, or, as a metaphysician lately put it, have been allowed to "lapse quietly from the academic consciousness." There has been some caprice and waste, some *anorexia scholastica;* but even these, as a Frenchman said of the crooked streets of Boston, "show zee liberté," and liberty is the greatest lesson and the chief need of our academic life. The elective system is still pushed by its chief apostle, and in the very important "Report of the Committee of Ten," just made under his guidance, becomes still more tempting and feasible for secondary schools.

The second great movement in our university history, still more foreign to the old college course, and no less epoch-making and beneficent, although, like electives, not new in principle, was marked by the opening of the Johns Hopkins University in 1876. This great endowment was deliberately developed by an exceptional Board of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trustees, and by a President whose understanding of the complex problems and the great needs of higher education in this country at that time left nothing to be desired; so that the next step was taken with no less boldness than sagacity. For the first time in American academic policy, quality took distinct precedence of quantity and numbers in studies, faculty, and students, and most previous lines of endeavor were cross-sectioned. A few subjects only at first, but those basal; a few professors, but men of marked and tried power, with generous salaries and appropriations, long tenures and large liberties; twenty $500 fellowships for select graduates; the least possible expenditure for buildings; stress laid upon research, with both time and incentive therefor; constant appeal to an extra-mural consensus of the competent by the baptism of printers' ink; later, a sharp look-out for promising new subjects and departures:—this was the striking *ensemble*. No wonder that some older leaders shook their heads at a scheme so far-sighted that only the next century will see all its justification; nor is it strange that some who lived nearest it were slow to realize how bright and beneficent was the fire there kindled. Of course there was misunderstanding, some hostility, special trials, and much suspended judgment. As late as 1883 President Eliot described the fellowship system as "paying students to come." But it was a choice little group of men, and the amount and quality of the work they did in their first decade is without precedent, at least in this country. Already its alumni are found in nearly every faculty of the land, and every institution has felt its influence. To have lived in that atmosphere so many years I count as the best influence of my life, and I pray that the wealthy and intelligent community of Baltimore may never permit any lapse to lower planes for want of that constant increase of revenue which both the rapid advance in science and academic development make necessary for every institution that would maintain its place.

Jonas G. Clark, Esq., the founder of Clark University, had personally studied and compared institutions of learning at home and abroad as no other great benefactor had ever done. In his first address to the Board of Trustees whom he had selected, he invited special attention to Johns Hopkins, and in his address at the opening of the University—which attracted hardly less wide and favorable attention—the highest standards and ideals were set forth. He suggested in memorable words a clear and simple policy which was in the central current of all the best tendencies in the best lands,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and is to-day, I believe, the ideal of almost every eminent man of science throughout the world. At any rate, the Board of Trustees, containing men of the highest eminence not only in Massachusetts but in the nation as well, took another epoch-making new step by dispensing at first with all undergraduate work. The boldness of this step appears in the fact that the chief source of income from tuition was thus cut off; moreover, 30 fellowships and scholarships were provided by the founder and his wife, yielding from $200 to $600 a year each. To be thus emancipated from routine teaching, marks, examinations, and other forms of tuition-earning, and to be left with ample opportunity to do his best work, was a boon as new as it will forever be welcome to every professor who has ability and inclination for higher scientific work.

Moreover, in our other best Universities, most graduate students are not so far advanced but they take a great part of their work in the undergraduate or A.B. department. Not to offer, but to presuppose this work is, therefore, to ensure a more advanced body of students. Finally, all the work of the University is focussed upon only six departments, with the hope of making these the best possible before others are established. This plan is the most expensive per man, seeks the best students from the widest area, and involves many items of policy not only new, but opposite to most current academic traditions. Instead of mass-teaching, individual work in the laboratory and seminary takes precedence. In place of the old and wasteful policy of rivalry and duplication, a policy of co-operation among institutions becomes inevitable. Instead of building up from below with preparatory school, then college, then University, growth is from above downward. Instead of being, like lower institutions, canals for the distribution of knowledge, the endeavor is also to co-operate in the work of the creation of the material of culture by research. The *raison d'être* of new institutions should be to lead, to be the first in new fields. Older institutions are conservative and must advance more slowly—although when they move they may carry greater momentum.

The Catholic University at Washington, D. C., opened in 1890, is the only other in the country devoted to graduate work alone, and is largely fed by our forty-nine Catholic colleges. The graduates of these who desired to become professors formerly had to go to Rome, Paris, or Louvain. It began with theology; it has a large scientific building nearly done, and has already even a chair of physiological psychology. It is, of course, small, having, at last accounts, thirty-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one students and twelve instructors. But its President is a man of sympathies so broad as to represent catholicity in its largest sense, and carries sympathy and awakens enthusiasm wherever he goes. Whether by design or not, the University was opened most opportunely to be lifted by, if not in a sense to represent, that most remarkable advance by which the Catholic Church seems now growing a century in a year. At any rate, it is an institution of great interest and the highest ideals, although, of course, celibacy greatly diminishes the cost of running a university. If the Catholic Church, with its vast wealth, power, and organization, is really about to take up science and modern culture, we may say, in view of the fact (as, indeed, we might also say of China, with its wonderful system of higher education, in which it is estimated that 1,000,000 scholars are devoting themselves to the highest ranges of an effete curriculum), let Protestant and Western culture look out for their laurels.

The founder of the University of Chicago has shown himself a man of no less sagacity and public spirit than wealth. He chose, no doubt, all things considered, the best and widest field in the country. By his method of giving only endowment funds, which are most needed, but least attractive to donors generally, and conditioning all upon local gifts of buildings, a degree of co-operation was secured, even before the University opened, that was without precedent. The plans of the University by the President were most comprehensive as well as detailed. Before the end of the first year there were thirty-five departments and one hundred and thirty-five instructors. The work of University Extension, with which the President was thoroughly familiar, was more completely organized and incorporated by the methods of both lecture and correspondence, and for the first time had the benefit of endowment. The plan for affiliated work included the co-operation of a large area of secondary schools, while many other unique features make the scheme as a whole almost suggestive of the University of France, full of interest and even inspiration, and in a masterly way fitted to the local genius of the city of the great Exposition. Every disinterested friend of higher education must wish to see the full realization of the plan at whatever expense; and with its present start, and thirty-nine Baptist colleges in the country to feed or co-operate with it, no institution seems to have better grounds for hope.

Our chief interest here, however, centres in a letter of Andrew H. Green, Esq., of New York city, a Worcester man who had taken

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much interest in the plan of Clark University, and who, in January 1891, as trustee of W. B. Ogden, asked if the Chicago trustees would accept an endowment of from $300,000 to $500,000 for a school of original scientific research among graduate students. The response was prompt and hearty. The President suggested that the best facilities possible be offered for scientific progress by professors "selected not because of their ability to teach or lecture, but rather on the ground of their ability to investigate." A graduate school of Arts and Literature has also been established.

If we extend our view for a moment beyond the field of Arts and Sciences, or the so-called Philosophical Faculty, we find that five years ago the best available statistics indicated that less than 10 per cent of the physicians in the country were college graduates, this being about half the percentage found in law and theology. Dr. J. H. Rauch, whose data seem best, thinks that of medical students enrolled in the 126 medical schools of the country, about 31 per cent, in 1890, were graduates, a decline of between 5 per cent and 6 per cent since 1880, even the Harvard Medical School showing a decline in the percentage of graduates. It was in the face of such a situation that the Johns Hopkins Medical School, with its ideal buildings and its great endowment, after sixteen years of preparation, opened last fall to graduates only. As a result it announces seventeen students for its twelve instructors, besides a number of physicians attending certain courses.

The plan for a great National University in the District of Columbia, first suggested by Washington, has been frequently advocated. It was very strongly pressed some fifteen years ago, and again, four years since, in the bill and by the committee of which Senator Edmunds was chairman. The idea, as he explained it to me, was for a University of Universities, and involved a national grant of $20,000,000 in four instalments. A modification of this scheme is now urged by Mr. Hoyt. So prominent an educator as Superintendent Mowry strongly urged a grant of $200,000,000. Meanwhile vast sums have been spent, and vast progress made, upon the government scientific work which centres in Washington. The permanency of the Coast Survey, imperilled by the apparently approaching end of the work for which it was at first created, seems happily now assured. Its work, and that of the Bureau of Weights and Measures, has been of the best. The Geological Survey (organized in 1879), which has grown to vast proportions under the energetic and broad-minded management of Major Powell, has come to control or aid the surveys of nearly every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State, has given employment to professors and students, and has so profoundly affected university work in geology that few institutions could undertake the best work without making terms with it. The Fish Commission (1870), the autonomy of which Dr. MacDonald has so far maintained, with its two well-equipped vessels for marine work, and an establishment at Wood's Holl so fine that it seems almost an act of gracious forbearance toward the modest summer school across the way that it refrains from teaching; the Smithsonian Institution, devoted to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, with its four series of publications, the activities of which have grown so fast that the Secretary prays for relief from several of them; the National Museum, which under the vigorous and far-sighted policy of its curators has lately grown to magnificent proportions, the zoological collections alone having increased so fast as to have apparently discouraged the Agassiz Museum at Cambridge; the noble new Observatory not yet complete; the Army and Medical Museum (1862) and Library, so largely indebted to the zeal and learning of Dr. Billings; the Bureau of Education (1867), with our first educational philosopher, Dr. W. T. Harris, at its head; Mr. Spofford and the new Congressional Library; the Agricultural Department (1862), with its staff of botanists and chemists and forty-six experiment stations employing 400 men; the Bureau of Ethnology (1879); Col. Carroll D. Wright and the Bureau of Statistics and Labor; the Botanic Garden; the Weather Bureau; the Patent Office; the Bureau of American Republics,—all these constitute an accumulation of the material of culture excelled in interest and extent in none of the foreign capitals save Paris only. It is not strange that the Methodist Church, with its forty-nine colleges (not including the sixteen Southern Methodist Episcopal colleges), should, like the Catholics, have chosen Washington, which already had two universities, as the location for its academic keystone. After the bills of Morrill (1862) and Hatch (1887), under a government that has appropriated 150,000,000 acres of land for scientific education, with a natural bond of sympathy, as Dr. Brown Goode has pointed out, between it and the thirty State universities which find little support for research in State legislatures, prophecy becomes uncertain, while both the vastness and the complexity of the situation offer increasing temptations to legislation. The great National University, if it ever comes, will hardly be to "strengthen the Federal bond," to fit office-holders for public life, to make political research its chief function, nor be sustained, as Provost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pepper suggested, like the American School at Athens, by an itinerant faculty appointed for a year or two from the leading colleges; but may come as unheralded and involve as little transformation as when President Patten declared Princeton College a University: *si quæris universitatem, circumspice.*

These newer institutions and corresponding movements in the older institutions have wrought great changes. About half of all the students in our 415 colleges still seek the A.B.; but this degree, especially in the West, often implies no Greek, or even Latin, and those seeking it are fewer and fewer. The most diverse opinions are held by those most competent. President Jordan thinks the college "belongs to the babyhood of culture"; President Gilman makes the college to designate the years of discipline, the university the period of freedom; ex-President White would have universities relegate the first two years to the colleges; Harvard tends toward a three years' course; I would degrade the A.B. degree at least a year in the best colleges; Columbia has the best solution of all in its mode of co-ordinating college and professional schools; General Walker thinks a good technical course produces "better educated men, in all that that term implies," than the ordinary college course; and Sir H. E. Roscoe derides the "highfalutin talk" about culture and the humanities, which may be for ten per cent, but not for the ninety per cent of humanity struggling for existence.

In university work we never lost, for we never had a consensus. Of our 139 self-styled universities, some, nearly all would grant, are "monohippic," and their course a sort of pedagogic ossuary. Professor Bryce thought that seven or eight, or at most twelve, deserved the term, and Professor von Holst finds only "a torso of a University" in the whole country. At any rate we do not meet the demand, or 411 American students would not be found, as they were last year, in the nine Prussian universities.

In fine, we are clearly in a period of transition, of golden opportunity, and things were never so plastic. The impending reconstructions, if they do not extend to all grades at once, should each be made with full view of the whole system. There are noble beginnings in right directions, but—let us see and say with the utmost clearness—only beginnings; for problems have grown faster than solutions. For the first time in this country we are coming to realize the true dimensions of educational questions in the sense of Lavisse, who says that they underlie all others and both test and enlarge statesman-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship. I conceive education as the science of human nature and the art of developing it to its fullest maturity; I can see a sense in which the *real* history of the world, from protoplasm up, is the history of education.

The university problem which is now upon us in all its vastness must lift us above low views of higher education, and it demands a larger academic policy than we have yet known. The university leaders of the future must have a more professional training than any of us. We revere the saints and heroes of the old course—Mark Hopkins, Knox, Woolsey, Peabody—and yield to none in admiration of present leaders; but the man of the future must be able to draw upon all the experience of success and failure in other lands; he must be more than an attorney for his corporation, with dollars and students for it in all he says and does, important as this function is; he must be helpful and co-operative and recognize a sphere where his own institution is a means and not an end; and the advancement of science must be nearer his heart than external advantage, if the two conflict. We must face problems both great and new. We have morselized the old curriculum, but our institutions are sometimes too large for either the best moral or intellectual ends. Paris, which has one-half the students in France, thinks so; so does Germany with half its students in three universities. The higher we go, the less we can duplicate, both on account of greater cost and the rarity of talent, and the more we must study the methods of supplementing and co-ordinating.

I deem it a fit time to recall the fact that it was universities that preserved freedom for us when Rome and titled orders fell; that codified the laws which made state and church, and edited the classics; that the quality of their work has determined the standing and value to the nation of each of the three learned professions; that it is they who have largely initiated and regulated progress; that their patronage has been the chief glory of states; and that the most comprehensive British Blue Book report ever made, reviewing some 20,000 foundations, new and centuries old, shows that of all the great charities higher education has proven safest, wisest, and best: first, because the superior integrity and ability of the guardians who consented to administer such funds, the intelligence and gratitude of those aided by them, and the strong interest and resulting publicity, all combined to hold them perpetually truest to the spirit of the founders; and secondly, because in improving higher education all other good causes are most effectively aided. Modern science, which in the last

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two decades has perhaps reared more academic buildings than existed before; which is coming to underlie all the arts of peace and war, and to train the experts who in more and more fields now rule the world, is now again giving to universities greatly enlarged functions, new problems, and almost a new meaning to the very word "university." That this new situation will be duly appreciated by a fair proportion of the one thousand millionaires in our land, and by legislators as well as by those who have set their hearts and minds upon the progress of true science in our great and beloved republic in this time of unprecedented educational opportunity, I have not for a moment a shadow of doubt.

G. STANLEY HALL.

[The discussion of this subject will be continued in later numbers of THE FORUM.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY CHRISTIAN MISSIONS HAVE FAILED IN INDIA.

To understand the tendency of modern Hindu thought, one must go to the beginning, and follow the course of philosophical speculation from the Vedic times to the present. Says Max Müller:

"If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life and has found solutions of them which well deserve the attention of those who have studied Plato and Kant, I should point to India. If I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, may draw that corrective, in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, and, in fact, more truly a human life, not for this life only, but for a transfigured and eternal life, again I should point to India."

This being so, it must be interesting to study the progress of the religious thought of the Aryans, from its infancy to its maturity. Again, every system of modern philosophy, excepting that of the Aryans, is the direct descendant of Aristotle, Plato, or Socrates. But Indian thought is indigenous, and unaffected by any foreign philosophy. Nay, it is highly probable that the Greek philosophers borrowed many of their ideas from it. On the banks of the Ganges, the Aryans grappled with the knotty problems of existence at a time when their western brothers were groping in darkness. To understand the philosophy of a people so ancient as the Aryans, to explore the thoughts that developed in a country acknowledged by all scholars to be the mother-land of religion and philosophy, it is necessary to go to her earliest records, which have been preserved (considering the foreign attacks that have been directed upon her mild sons) in marvellous purity,—the Vedas. Through these Vedic hymns runs the idea of the one God of nature, not an extra-cosmic creator standing apart from the created, and meting out rewards and punishments, but a permanent essence underlying the whole universe, material and spiritual, of which the various forces of nature are merely manifestations. They were the attempts of the growing intellect of man to comprehend the Brahma which Western philosophy has not yet comprehended. Brought face to face with the various aspects of nature, surrounded by an incomprehensible force whose subtle in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fluence they felt, the simple-minded Aryans awoke to a sense of the Divine. Let us go into details: Colebrook, Bentley, and others say that the Vedas were arranged in their present shape 1100 or 1200 years before Christ; Max Müller says that the time was 2000 years before Christ. Thus they will make the Vedas 3000 to 4000 years old, but Rig-veda, the oldest, is more than 4,000 years old.

Let us now see what influence Christianity has had on the religious thought of India. Three hundred years have elapsed since the early Dutch and Portuguese traders set their foot in India. Mussulmans, Mahrattas, Afghans, and others have in turn ravaged India. But the Occidentals supplied the material which created the new "civilization"; and hence a short history of them will not be out of place.

When the various schools of philosophy in India were at the height of their glory, what we call European nations had no existence. The ancient kingdoms of Chaldea, Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt were in their palmy days contemporaneously with the best times of Aryan philosophy. Greece and Persia came afterward, and at the beginning of the Christian era Rome was the mistress of the West. The supremacy of Rome came to an end about the third century after Christ, and to a certain extent the foundation of the modern European civilizations was laid. Christianity, though already born in Jerusalem, only at this time spread in the Roman Empire (which totteringly prolonged its existence to the twelfth century), and, mingling itself with the older religious sentiments of Egypt and Greece, it spread through Roman influence in the whole of Europe. The ancient kingdoms of Chaldea, Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome had accepted the spiritualistic philosophy as found in the Vedas, Upanishadas, and the Yoga system. At that time literature and art were flourishing, of which the great Library of Alexandria was a testimony. It can be easily seen that, as long as Christianity followed the line of ancient thought, it had in it the essence of the older spiritualism (soul-theory). While Christianity was thus continuing its existence, the Caliphate of Bagdad rose into prominence under the influence of Islam in Arabia. The Pope, the representative of Christ on the one hand, and Caliph, the head of the Mohammedan faith on the other, between them extirpated all literature and art. Although these were dark times, the spiritualistic idea was not quite extinct. Also, about now, the Crusaders began to come to Asia. Genoa, Venice, and Portugal began their mercantile connections with India. Asiatic thought was then brought into Europe. The power of Constantinople,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was a branch of the Roman Empire, broke down; and the Library at Constantinople, which had been looted, spread philosophical thought throughout Europe. Commerce was on the increase; people were being educated in the warlike arts; gunpowder and other blessings of civilization, and the art of printing, were invented. By this time also America was discovered.

The land and climate of the Western countries are different from those of India. In the former the climate is cold, and people have to wrest from the unwilling soil, fit for cultivation for only a few months in the year, a meagre livelihood. Hence it will be seen that the very conditions of these countries are not favorable to the growth of spiritualistic thought. They are eminently fit for bringing out all kinds of materialism, and they did so. Bacon and Descartes, the apostles of new schools, opened new paths of inquiry. They would not take for granted the older thoughts without putting them to new tests. Materialism came into prominence. The very existence of the soul was doubted. They attempted to prove that everything can be established by the assumption of the existence of matter, and matter only. Atheistic materialism began to proclaim itself as an established fact. It thrust its head into the social relations and political affairs of men. Its cries were heard everywhere—in the arts, in the sciences and discoveries; and with it appeared the glittering civilization of the nineteenth century, and from this time we may date the relationship of the Indian people with European countries, and thus the materialism which was reigning in the West set its foot in the East.

The dogmas of Christianity—at least of Protestantism—are these: that God, the Creator of the Universe, is an extra-cosmic being, standing aloof from his creation; that Jesus the Christ is his Son; that he was incarnated for the purpose of saving mankind, and, preaching truth, sacrificed himself for the welfare of man; that faith in him, and him alone, will save man, and that the believers in reincarnation, idol-worship, and in the efficacy of rites and ceremonies, are destined to everlasting perdition; that, as Christ sacrificed himself, so must his followers sacrifice themselves to spread universal love, and that this leads to their final salvation, the peace of God. Looked at superficially, they seem very good, and to people unaccustomed to religious and philosophical thoughts they may appear as fostering the idea of love and brotherhood.

It is no wonder, then, that, at a time when the true spirit of Aryan philosophy was obscured by superficial rites and ceremonies,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the teaching of the Christian missionaries could find favor with the natives of India. As the merchants went there for secular trade, so did the missionaries go for religious trade. But thanks are due to their self-sacrificing efforts, which have brought to the Western world the various languages till then unknown. They deserve much credit for all this; but a thousand times more credit is due to the Aryan religion, that, notwithstanding their great efforts, not a single true Aryan has been converted in these three or four hundred years. When the early missionaries found they failed, which might have been expected had they known anything about the material they had to deal with; when they found it impossible to convert the people to a religion for which they cannot possibly have any sympathy,—most of them wisely abandoned their efforts and betook themselves to a more laudable undertaking, the education of the masses.

The radical differences between the Christian and Aryan religions are not, perhaps, clear to most people; but those who have pondered on this subject see the all-sufficing nature of Hindu philosophy,—how the simplest mind can have its cravings satisfied, how the intellectual giant can accept their reasonings; and they do not wonder that Christianity, with its narrow and intolerant dogmas, makes such little progress among the Hindus. Christianity has ended with the idea of an extra-cosmic creator; but the Aryan philosophy started with this theory, and soared higher and higher, till it lost itself in the essential identity and oneness of the intelligent cosmos. The human mind cannot soar higher.

Christianity boasts of the time-worn saying of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; but what is this compared with the universal love of the Aryans? Says the Bhagavad Ghita, "The enlightened look with equal love upon a Brahmin full of learning and righteousness, upon a chandala (the lowest of castes), a cow, an elephant, or a dog." Other religions teach, Love your neighbor as yourself; the Aryan philosophy teaches, Look upon all as upon yourself. The philosophy of the absolute does not respect caste or creed, color or country, sex or society. It is the religion of pure and absolute love to all, from the tiniest animalcule to the biggest man. Above all, the Aryan philosophy is expressly tolerant of all shades of religion and belief, for it looks upon all the different modes of thought as so many ways to realization of the absolute, devised to suit the capacity of various recipients.

The Christian might say that there is little difference between the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Essence that underlies the Universe" and their own God. True, the Essence is one; but the moment you attribute human qualities to this Essence and limit it by human conditions, you diverge from us. The ways our different conceptions of God affect our conduct have thus admirably been set forth by a learned Hindu:

"Let us for a moment try to analyze the moral standard of those who abide by the theory of an extra-cosmic Supreme Being, requiring strict obedience at our hands to his commands. There is the same difference between the conduct of the Deist and the Vedantin as between the conduct of one carrying out the orders of an intelligent master and another following the dictates of his own convictions. The distinction between one's self and the rest of the world creates a kind of corresponding difference, it may be, sometimes even direct opposition, between one's moral conduct toward either. What holds good for himself may sometimes not hold good for the world at large, and *vice versâ*. When we add to these two a governor supervising the whole and listening to our prayers, we set up a third standard of morality, at times unifying the other two in itself, at times jarring with all. The war of individuals, which is the greatest evil of the present day, is a result of the theistic code of ethics. As the right of man to rule over man gives rise to all the various shades of monarchical government and creates unnatural social barriers, so does the idea of an extra cosmic deity enslave reason and give full play to emotion, thus setting up the disagreeable war of individuals. The highest moral ideal conceivable results from looking on the Universe as nothing apart from the individual self, and *vice versâ*, and from feeling that the individual is but a sentient fibre of the intelligent whole, rising with its rise, and falling, so to say, with its fall.

"The end and aim of Christianity is to satisfy the emotional by subjecting man to a Supreme Being through fear of whom he keeps to the path of righteousness, in order that, by fulfilling His commandments, he may ascend to heaven to sit at the right of the Eternal Throne. In India, religion has a triple aspect. It comprises cosmology, ontology, and ethics. Religion, then, is not that something which satisfies the emotional nature of man by setting up for adoration some ideal of all that is good and virtuous. Religion is that rational demonstration of the universe which explains the aim and object of existence, shows the relation of man to man, and supplies that real criterion of being which satisfies reason and ennobles emotion. In its passive aspect religion addresses itself to reason, and explains the nature and relation of God, man, and universe, shows the real aim of existence, and lays down the rules of right conduct. In its active aspect it reveals to the heart of man the supremest ideal of love and bliss—an ideal which it ever strives to approach. Religion, by the satisfaction of both these essential parts of the nature of man, leads to mental peace, spiritual exaltation, universal good—all culminating in absolute self-realization."

These are some of the differences between Christianity and the Aryan philosophy which make the former unacceptable to the educated in India; but there are other and more potent reasons which make it popularly disagreeable. The conduct of the early Christians in India was anything but holy. Steeped in drunkenness and debauchery, they horrified the simple-minded Hindu by their defiance of the moral codes of God and man. Nor was the conduct of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

officials of the East India Company exemplary. In the Bengali novels, "Maharajah Nandakumar," and "Gunga Govina Singh, or the Right Hand of Warren Hastings," is drawn a picture of the inhuman cruelty and the gross misconduct of these brutal wretches—a disgrace to their nation and their religion. Well may their brothers disclaim any connection with them and denounce them as defiers of religion; but they were, after all, the pioneers of Christianity in India.

Again, the Christians, being meat-eaters and wine-imbibers, seem to us to represent a religion devoid of humane practices; for, to the mild Hindu, brotherhood does not mean simply the brotherhood of man, but the brotherhood of all living beings. That representatives of nations who fatten and kill for selfish gratification millions of hogs and steers a day should preach humanity to an already humane community, is beyond the comprehension of the Indian mind. I am not saying that Christianity requires a man to eat animal food, but there is a prevalent opinion in India that a person becomes a Christian simply to gratify his appetite, to eat prohibited food and to drink intoxicating liquor. When a Hindu is seen going into a church, his co-religionists say nothing; but if he is seen going into a grog-shop, his friends say, "He has turned a Christian." Indeed, they seem to think that animal food and spirituous liquors are inseparable incidents of Christianity.

What have the missionaries done to disabuse the people of this impression? Have they shaped their course to suit the true idea of humanity? People of the western civilizations cannot understand the disgust and unutterable horror which the eating of animal food produces in the Hindu mind. Why, one of the objections that the Hindus raise against foreign travel is the fear, almost amounting to a conviction, that their young men would contract in western countries these irreligious habits. It seems strange that Christians, who say that they are willing to sacrifice their lives for their religion, cannot afford to sacrifice the gratification of their palate. They say that we are heathens. Are the people who believe in the eternity of soul, the doctrine of reincarnation, in the law of Karma and universal justice, and who practise the humanity that they preach all the seven days of the week, are they heathens? Or is it the people who say that the soul of man had its beginning in time, but will pass into eternity, meaning thereby that it is eternal at one end without being so at the other (a contradiction in terms); who believe that man was bound down to destiny by the freak of an irresponsible Being—judge and prosecutor at the same time; and who preach brotherhood on Sun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days, and the rest of the week meet in political cabinets to cut the throats of their weaker brothers, and to grind down poverty-stricken nations simply to enrich themselves? I ask, Is it not these that are heathens? If to believe in one's own deeds as the cause of one's condition; if to depend on one's self for final bliss rather than on a constituted attorney; if to preach and practise humanity towards all sentient beings instead of a small portion of them,—if this is heathenism, I am proud—doubly and trebly proud—to be called a heathen.

Moreover, the tendency of modern university education in India is so thoroughly materialistic and so mercilessly iconoclastic that it shatters not only the idols of superstition, so-called, of the Hindu, but so affects the mind that it cannot receive any religion at all. It produces skeptics and agnostics by the thousand, but never a Christian. Thus, modern science and modern thought, instead of implanting anything new in the naturally speculative minds of the Hindus, simply destroy the seeds of religion already there. But one good has resulted—and that is, it has put Aryan philosophy to the test, and stirred the Hindus more generally to study their ancient language—that storehouse of religious philosophy, which in comprehensiveness and daring speculation defies comparison.

Those that wish to teach a new religion must bear in mind that the first condition is that they must have a thorough knowledge, not only of their own religion, but also of the one they intend to supplant. They must also understand the manners, the customs, the condition, the religious susceptibilities and sentiments of the people. Have the Christian missionaries done so? Have they understood the philosophy of the Aryans? Have they mastered their sacred language? Even when Christian teachings disturb the Hindu mind, it does not fly to Christianity for rest, but takes refuge in some of those so-called reforming religious societies of India, which have borrowed Christian thought and displayed it in Hindu garbs. Fortunately the old orthodoxy is reviving, and the new-fangled societies are getting smaller in number.

We may not be able to convert each other; but we can accomplish not a little in promoting tolerance and friendship, and in showing the American people that missions in India are not the phenomenal success that they were represented to be. From what has been said above it will be apparent that Christian missionaries in India have to encounter insuperable difficulties, and that their labor is wasted labor.

VIRCHAND R. GANDHI.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENTS IN SURGERY.

In a general way the ordinary reader is familiar with the advances made in the different departments of surgery, and understands them sufficiently to be struck with wonder at the results. In fact, to the average mind, it appears to be pretty well settled that hardly anything is impossible of accomplishment when skill with the knife is called in question in battling with what were formerly considered to be incurable maladies. And truly, in comparing the present with the past, there is less room for exaggeration in this belief than would at first be supposed.

While this may serve as a general statement as applied to surgery in all civilized countries, the task of treating advance and progress from a strictly American standpoint is not an easy one. The reason is apparent when we consider that surgery, like every other science, is cosmopolitan in its aims and international in its influences. Thus, considering the rapidity and readiness with which new discoveries are appropriated and utilized throughout the scientific world, it is almost impossible to confine real improvements within comparatively limited areas; but sufficient has been done in an originative way by American surgeons to give their country a distinctive claim for consideration in crediting the notable advances which have placed surgery where it is to-day.

When we study the reason for the progress thus made, we must not lose sight of the controlling influences of national characteristics. Americans are noted the world over for their ingenuity of invention, independence of thought, and enthusiasm of purpose. These attributes have explained results from the time surgery had a history in this country. In earlier periods of settlement little could be accomplished by scientific study. The opportunities for its peaceful pursuit were not possible while fighting Indians, clearing forests, and developing new territories. The sole dependence for scientific advancement was upon the observations, experience, and work of others in the centres of European civilization. When, however, the country was in a measure developed, the scientific men commenced to develop

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves, to establish hospitals, found colleges, and branch out in advancing lines. Thus it is only within a comparatively recent period that American Medicine, as such, had any beginning.

What may be considered as the first epoch in American surgery was the American discovery of Etherization, which was effected conjointly by Morton, Jackson, and Wells. Until that time, almost within the recollection of the older practitioners of the present day, the patient who was the subject of a surgical operation suffered untold tortures of pain during its performance, instead of being, as now, rendered absolutely unconscious during the entire ordeal. When a student, the writer often heard the recitals of the experiences of older men who operated before ether was known. The vivid description by Valentine Mott, of the sufferings of the poor victims, would touch the sympathy of the hardest heart. To transform such ordeals of agony into peaceful, dreamless sleep was for American surgery a triumph second to none in the long category of its other brilliant achievements. In fact it was the starting-point for all the subsequent possibilities of almost miraculous ventures. If America had made no other contribution for the relief of suffering humanity than this wonderful discovery, it would entitle her to the lasting gratitude of all mankind. But she has so creditably done her part since then in her glorious task, that she has in surgery, as in other scientific work, made a history of her own.

During the late War of the Rebellion she made her next grand record by notable work upon the battle-field and in hospital. The major operations performed during that period were commensurate with the vast number of wounded requiring surgical aid. Never before in the history of any war were so many so successfully or promptly cared for. Indeed, after the elaborate records were finished, and the results published, it was asserted by a leading spirit in the French Academy that America held the surgical sceptre of the world. Attesting the truth of this is the remarkable collection of specimens in the Army Medical Museum at Washington, which is unequalled in variety and number anywhere on the globe. The elaborate histories of these silently impressive texts established new principles of procedure which were hitherto unknown to the scientific world, and gave American surgery a just recognition for originality of conception, boldness of execution, and success of practice. With a training equal to any emergency, while ever ready to adopt and enlarge upon the views of others, she has not been slow in advancing on new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lines and securing new triumphs. In almost every department of the healing art, America has not only made valuable discoveries, but has improved upon those by others. Herein has been demonstrated the resources of ingenuity in the creation of new principles and the elaboration of old ones. The aim has been to simplify methods and thus give them a greater adaptability and a wider practical application.

In the treatment of fractures, for instance, this is strikingly manifest in the discarding of cumbersome apparatus and the substitution of simpler and more effective ones. There is hardly a bone in the body which, when broken, has not been benefited by the American plan of treatment. Notably prominent in this category may be mentioned fractures of the thigh and of the shafts of other long bones. It was reserved for Gurdon Buck, a former surgeon of the New York Hospital, to prove that fractures of the thigh could be most successfully and comfortably adjusted by replacing the complicated harness of straps, stretching-screws, and heavy splint braces, with the simplest form of weight-and-pulley extension. By this method the muscles themselves are made to act, for the most part, as splints, steadying the long axis of the broken bone, and keeping it in proper position by an easy, certain, and constant traction of the foot against the weight of the reclining body. After a trial of over a quarter of a century it has so stood the test of wide experience that nothing better has been found to take its place; and now the American plan is the one universally adopted.

The demonstration of the utility of plaster-of-paris splints was likewise made by an American surgeon, the late Dr. James L. Little, who years ago brought it to its present state of perfection. The same principle of fixation was also adopted in an original way by Dr. Lewis A. Sayre, also an American, to the treatment of diseases and deformities of the spine, by encasing the trunk in a plaster corset. The simplicity and effectiveness of this treatment are now so well established that Sayre's plaster jacket is indorsed by every surgical writer and used by every surgical practitioner. The same may be said of his original treatment of fractures of the collar-bone, and of his methods of extension in hip diseases.

It would be difficult to enumerate what has been done by Americans in the matter of devising new instruments for the easier and more successful performance of surgical operations. Not only in the creation of new things, but in the useful modification of old ones,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the ingenuity of the American practitioner is most strikingly manifest. Simplicity and effectiveness are the main objects aimed at in this line. In these two particulars it is safe to say we excel all other nations. The English and Germans aim at solidity rather than delicacy, while the French have a grace and finish which is generally joined to complexity of construction. In the American instrument we are inclined to combine the good qualities of all with an adaptation peculiarly our own. Thus it is that we are always on the alert to substantially improve what we do not actually invent, and in that respect stand ready to advance with all others in our line of work. The perfect instrument and the trained touch have done much to earn the present reputation for American skill, and are destined in future to efficiently maintain it.

The ready adaptability of the American mind to the notable advances in surgery has been shown in the matter of aseptic surgery first advocated by the distinguished Scotch surgeon, Sir Joseph Lister. During a visit to this country in 1876, Lister explained his doctrine, demonstrated its application, and proved its grand results. Immediately thereafter every operator throughout America became an enthusiastic convert, and added, by the more brilliant results then possible, to the triumph of the new idea. America was the first to feel the real impulse for good which this discovery made tangible. The American surgeon followed its precepts with an ardor of purpose and directness of aim which helped to place it in the foremost rank of great discoveries. Indeed it may be said that cleanliness in surgery marked an epoch second only to that associated with the discovery of Anæsthesia. By its means operations became feasible which before were never dreamed of, and results were obtained which were previously beyond the reach of human endeavor. To one who has watched this progress, who has noted the steady advance of brilliant achievement, and become practically cognizant of the lasting benefits of the new departure, the lesson has been so overwhelmingly impressive that the temptation to be enthusiastic as to the future is well-nigh irresistible. It has not only given a new impetus to American surgery, and aided its substantial progress, but its influence is felt in every part of the world where the art is scientifically practised for the relief of human suffering and for the saving of human life. So well is this idea established in the popular mind, that almost miraculous cures, daring ventures, and the boldest of procedures are scarcely looked upon as out of the range of ordinary expectation. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is now something so tangibly demonstrative in the recovery of desperate cases that no room is left for argument and no cause for doubt. The skilful hand, the accurate knowledge, and the fertile resources of the surgeon, place his science nearly on the level of an exact one, enabling him not only to determine with almost unerring certainty the pathological condition of a given trouble, but to demonstrate its presence and overcome its otherwise mortal tendency.

It is, however, unnecessary to prove what is now generally considered a self-evident proposition, as we can more interestingly and instructively allude to a few of the illustrations upon which the accepted conclusions are founded.

Take, for instance, in this connection, the advances which have been made in abdominal surgery, and for which America can claim no small share of credit. In fact, this country may be said to have originated all the wonderful possibilities connected with this special line of practice. The first one who dared to invade the abdominal region with a knife, and lay bare the vitals, was a Kentucky surgeon, Ephraim McDowell. From the time of the successful performance of that operation in 1809, for the removal of an intra-abdominal tumor, a new field was opened for the mitigation of suffering and saving of life, the cultivation of which has prolonged the average human existence several thousand years. It required more than ordinary courage on the part of the country surgeon to propose to his desperate patient a procedure that was not only entirely new, but one against which the entire profession had set its opinion and opposed its sanction. It was one of those events marking the line of progress which combine romance with history, and which embalms the memory of the one who could do and dare at the right moment, in the immortal recognition of a grateful humanity. The degree of responsibility involved in the conclusion to resort to an heroic endeavor to relieve the suffering patient, away from all means of consultation with his fellows, and the determination to follow the conviction of a deliberate choice of means, can scarcely be realized when it is understood that he virtually stood alone in his opinion. In fact, when it became known in the district that such an operation was contemplated, not only the entire professional brotherhood was arrayed against him, but the neighbors threatened him with mobbing and outrage should the so-called "dastardly experiment" fail. Even during the performance of the operation, an angry crowd surrounded the house, prepared to carry its threat into execution. But the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fidence of the patient, Mrs. Crawford, was not to be shaken, and surgeon and patient fought out the battle to a triumphant issue. This circumstance was not so unusual of itself; but, in view of the immense benefits of which it was the initiation, it is entitled to a proper reference and suggestive comment in the history of substantial advancements in surgery. It was not until years afterward that proper recognition was given to this bold move, and half a century elapsed before a suitable monument was raised over the remains of the talented innovator. Now the utility of the operation is so well recognized, that not to perform it in proper cases would render any surgeon guilty of gross negligence to the best interests of his patients. As might have been expected, and as is usual in such cases, when a good principle is firmly established, and the good reasons for its practical application are substantially confirmed, numerous efforts were made to rob the discoverer of his justly earned reputation by the claim of priority on the part of others. But all such efforts eventually proved fruitless, and the right of the American surgeon to a first place in the rank of human benefactors is now unquestioned.

The work of McDowell, when its importance was duly appreciated, opened up a new field of practice which has widened into a distinct and almost exclusive department of surgery. It was not long before Kimball, the brothers Atlee, Peaslee, Thomas, and many other American surgeons, as well as Spenser Wells in England, and Keith in Scotland, verified the conclusions of McDowell, and demonstrated their practical worth by extensive and successful practice.

Contemporaneously with these appeared Dr. J. Marion Sims, a Southern surgeon, who came to New York thirty-five years ago to demonstrate entirely new and progressive methods for the surgical treatment of female troubles. As a result of successful work in that line he founded the Woman's Hospital in that city, and attained such world-wide fame in his specialty, that, when he went abroad during the War of the Rebellion, his counsel and operative skill were sought in every capital of Europe. To him more than to any one else belongs the credit of establishing the new school of gynecology which is now acknowledged to be a true American innovation, and which has won recognition throughout the world. Sims's name is associated with more new instruments and original operations than that of any other of his countrymen. It was truthfully said of him during his lifetime that he could settle himself in any of the great cities on either side of the Atlantic and command a lucrative practice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by what was really a cosmopolitan reputation. His impress upon the practice of his specialty is still felt everywhere, and the broad principles laid down by him in his numerous and valuable contributions to surgical literature are still considered in the highest degree authoritative by his numerous enthusiastic followers. The estimation in which he was held by his profession was substantially demonstrated by a fund for a monument from contributions representing not only a large constituency of his countrymen, but of representative medical men of every nationality. This monument, now nearly completed, will be erected in one of the public parks of New York, and will be the first of its kind in that city which will prove to be a public tribute to distinguished surgical services.

The operation for appendicitis, concerning which so much is said nowadays, was of American origin. Willard Parker, a surgeon of New York, demonstrated its practicability in 1867, since which time the technique has been much improved, also by American surgeons, and notably by Bull, McBurney, Weir, Stimson, Morris, and others. Previously the dangerous forms of this disease were uniformly fatal, and were designated as one of the varieties of inflammation of the bowels, or peritonitis. Contrary to this generally accepted belief, appendicitis is now of no more frequent occurrence than formerly; but as it is more readily recognized, and its cure is almost uniformly assured, it naturally claims an extra attention, especially from such as now learn of its existence for the first time. And yet such operations were performed successfully over a quarter of a century ago. Parker plainly saw the indications of opening an abscess, and thus, following out a recognized surgical rule, very consistently advocated the procedure. His high standing in his profession secured becoming consideration for his recommendation, and his view was accepted accordingly. It was the advocacy of an old principle in a new form. His first cases being successful, his plan of treatment became at once an accepted method of practice. From such a beginning has been evolved an operation the subsequent perfection of which challenges comparison in the brilliancy of its results with that of any other in the long list of life-saving measures.

In other departments of abdominal surgery Americans have done useful work. Take, for instance, the bold evacuation of the gall-bladder by external incision. Bobbs, an American, was the first to do this as long ago as 1867, while the establishment and practical perfection of the operation was due to Sims in 1878. It will also be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recollected that the latter surgeon, when the lamented Garfield received his mortal wound, suggested that laparotomy be performed for the finding of the ball. Had Garfield's wound been inflicted in these times, this would undoubtedly have been the operation that would have been performed for his relief. But the expedients of to-day were not known then, and the thought carries with it a tinge of regret which offsets the best-directed efforts only known to be available at that time. The perfection which has been attained in the improvement of *technique* in intra-abdominal work is one of the natural outcomes of Yankee ingenuity and self-reliant pluck. An account of the number and variety of such manœuvres would not only extend this article beyond its required limits, but could hardly be made intelligible to the lay reader. Suffice it to say, however, that it is now found possible to operate with success upon all the important abdominal organs. Portions of diseased intestines are now cut away, the severed ends being united by stitches, the intestinal current is artificially switched from its course by the opening and entwining of adjoining intestinal loops, new communications are made between the intestines and the stomach, and between the gall-bladder and intestines. Tumors are removed from the stomach, liver, pancreas, and kidney; and other intestinal organs are removed almost with impunity, while many of the organs themselves are incised with subsequent recovery of the patient. In all these procedures our own surgeons have not only taken an active part, but have devised improved modifications which have been respected and adopted abroad. In this, as in other American modifications, the aim has been to simplify methods and make them proportionably safe. Thus we have Abbe's improved plan of stitching the intestine, McBurney's open treatment of hernia, and Murphy's intra-intestinal button. The latter is an exceedingly ingenious device which makes it possible to clamp adjoining sides of intestines or of other hollow viscera together and establish a communication between the two; and when the button has done its work it finds its escape by the natural passage through the alimentary canal.

The farther we go in the enumeration of American discoveries and improvements, the more there appears to say. Although abdominal surgery has of late commanded the larger share of attention, and, comparatively speaking, may be said to have made the greater progress, there are other departments of the science and art which may well merit passing reference. In brain-surgery, for instance,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our work has been fully abreast with that of our transatlantic brethren. Although to Victor Horsley of London is due the credit of popularizing operations upon the brain, our own men here quickly followed in his footsteps and materially aided the rapid accumulation of remarkable statistics. Even before such ventures were made, Fluhrer succeeded in extracting a bullet which traversed the brain, by trephining the skull on the opposite side.

While referring to the finding of bullets in out-of-the-way places, it is just to say that an exact diagnosis as to locality cannot always be made by a recourse to the ordinary methods of examination. Missiles, in striking tissues of different density, are so apt to be deflected from their course, that the uncertainty of finding them is rather the rule than the exception. This was the great trouble in President Garfield's case. Guiteau's bullet struck the right eleventh rib, and, instead of glancing downward, as was supposed, and lodging in the groin, it took an entirely different course, ploughing its way through the spinal column to the left, and lodging under the pancreas behind the stomach. Various means were employed at the time to ascertain the exact position of the ball, but without avail. The telephone persisted in giving such false indications that more doubt than ever was thrown upon the case. Had the telephone probe invented by Girdner been known in that day, the ball would doubtless have been found before the autopsy. As an appreciation of the estimation in which the probe of this American surgeon is held, we find it acknowledged as the best yet presented, and one which every army surgeon looks upon as invaluable. What might it not have done for Garibaldi in discovering the bullet in his ankle, and in rendering almost unnecessary the invention of Nelaton's porcelain probe?

In the treatment of internal troubles by instrumentation, many other important discoveries have been made in this country during the past few years. Sims's speculum is known and used throughout Christendom. Another equally famous instrument is Bigelow's lithotrite for crushing vesical calculi, and his ingenious evacuator for disposing of the *débris*. Both of these instruments so revolutionized the old system of practice in the particular lines for which they were adapted, that nothing now takes the place of the American contrivances. It is within a very short period that O'Dwyer's intubation tubes for the treatment of suffocative croup put in their claim for recognition, but they are now almost universally used in all the class of cases for which they are so eminently suitable and so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

markedly efficacious. Although the original idea was promulgated many years ago by a Frenchman, it brought forth no practical fruit until it was revived by O'Dwyer, and its practical utility was ably and convincingly demonstrated by him. The story of advances in the management of throat affections would not be complete from an American point of view without reference to what was done by the late Horace Green in proving that a medicated probang could be introduced directly into the windpipe past the vocal cords, and that by such means topical applications could be made. This was for a long time believed to be impossible; but Green was merely ahead of his time, and it was not until after his death that the value of the demonstration was acknowledged. Indeed it was due to the establishment of the broad principles held by Green that many of the more modern throat operations are rendered practicable, a notable culmination of which was the dexterously delicate manipulation of Mackenzie on the late Emperor of Germany.

In reparative surgery, improvements of American origin have also marked the general progress of skilled manipulative procedure. Pre-eminent in this line of work were Buck, Post, and Sabine. The cunning trickery of the reconstructive art caused transplanted skin-flaps to grow in new places, correcting hideous deformities about the face, and virtually reforming parts which had been previously destroyed by accident or disease. The nose, the mouth, the cheeks, and even the eyelids took new shape and substance from their skilful handling and accurate methods of adjustment. Sabine made perhaps the most radical departure from accepted methods, by forming the basis of a new nose by attaching the forefinger of the patient to the forehead, allowing it to grow there, and afterward amputating the finger from the hand. Another American surgeon succeeded in supplying a new cheek by first growing an attached arm-flap to the forefinger of the patient, and in turn severing the arm attachment, carrying the finger, with its growing flap, to the face, sewing the flap in place, and afterward liberating the finger. The skin of the arm thus became the substance of the cheek.

It is a pleasant contemplation to go over in one's mind the number of American names that have become famous in the annals of surgery. We have but to mention Mott, McDowell, Rodgers, Stevens, Post, Parker, Buck, Gross, Warren, Bigelow, and others who have gone, and compare them with our present lights, to be assured that America still holds her own and promises still more for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her future. Among those who have added lustre to our good name is Stephen Smith, whose improved amputation at the knee-joint has won for him a place in every text-book. A leading London surgeon, while on a recent visit to this country, said that he would have considered it the crowning act of his career to have been so creditably associated with such a simple, useful, and practical operation. This can be mentioned, in passing, as one of the many tributes paid by leading foreigners to the character of work done here. Then, again, comes Wyeth with his original plan of bloodless amputation through the hip-joint, placing a hitherto dreadful and formidable operation upon a comparatively simple and harmless basis. Many other American names are associated with particular operations or instruments. That of Emmet deserves a leading place in his specialty. Gouley's tunnelled catheter is the only instrument to-day that is capable of overcoming hitherto unsurmountable difficulties. Phelps, by his open method of tenotomy, makes many of the more untractable forms of contracture easier of treatment and simpler of cure; and Sexton, with his perfected operation for the extirpation of the diseased bones of the ear, attacks the obscurer forms of deafness with a success that gives new hope to a large class of forlorn sufferers.

The safe and comfortable conveyance of the sick and wounded by the ambulance system is essentially an American device. During the late war it was brought almost to its present state of elaboration of detail by the labors and exertions of Howard, Letterman, Dalton, and other army surgeons. Its creation grew out of the necessity for the rapid transfer of wounded men from the battlefield, and developed from an improved litter to a wheeled couch which could be tenderly and swiftly borne over the roughest of roads. Thus the American ambulance is the model of its kind, and challenges every criticism against an almost world-wide adaptability.

In attempting, even in a cursory manner, to present an outline of America's part in progressive surgery, incident and sequence present themselves in such order and force that we hardly know where to draw the line. If any reasonable charge of partiality can be made, we offer the plea of sticking to the text. But while doing so we cannot shut our eyes to what has been accomplished in the same line by other countries, particularly England, France, and Germany. All these have done their share in making surgery a cosmopolitan science, and its advanced practice an international art. America's pre-eminent credit is urged from the fact that she is the youngest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation, has developed with the greatest rapidity, has overcome the most obstacles, and, if we do say it, has within the time commanded the greatest successes.

If we attempt to analyze the reasons for this by the study of national character, we must study them in their particular relations to environment, and as bearing on the controlling necessities of a rapidly progressive evolution. The determination which landed our Pilgrims, the pluck which cleared our forests, the ambition which extended our boundaries, the independence which founded the Republic, the labor which extended our railroads, the spirit which harnessed the lightning, and the enterprise which established our commerce,—were the natural factors in the development of national traits. The forces were active and retroactive. All the better qualities of a progressive spirit were necessarily brought out in the meeting of special and pressing emergencies. When such are in constant and active development, why should not America lead in surgery as in other practical sciences?

GEORGE F. SHRADY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A DEFINITE STEP TOWARD MUNICIPAL REFORM.

In forming an estimate of the significance of the recent Conference for Good City Government held in Philadelphia, it may be well at the outset to glance at some of the circumstances which determined that such a gathering should at that time be held. A small group of men in Philadelphia, who for some years past have taken an active part in local reform movements to secure purer politics, became strongly convinced that some step should be taken to bring about a fuller recognition of the importance of moral principles in politics, and, as a sequel to such recognition, the adoption of a practical working scheme by which higher standards might be maintained in actual practice. It was evident that some new plan must be devised to check the stream of political demoralization which, constantly increasing in force and volume, was becoming more and more unruly under ineffectual efforts to control it.

The outlook seemed to justify this estimate of the dangerous condition of American politics. In the richest and most important State of the Union no scheme for increasing the power of the political machine was too unscrupulous or too audacious to be attempted, usually with successful results; and a "conspiracy for the acquisition of public plunder" was in undisputed control of New York city, with a strong representation in the United States Senate. To that body Pennsylvania, too, had just returned a senator who had apparently spared no pains to convince his constituents that he had been guilty of a dishonest use of State funds, and had subsequently showed how little such a course interfered with the maintenance of his political ascendency. In New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and many other cities, all kinds of fraud in the management of elections were matters of common and almost unnoticed occurrence, while in the transaction of municipal business, abuses of various sorts were rife, —schemes, jobs, speculations, involving large direct financial losses to the cities concerned, and perhaps greater indirect losses through inefficiency and mismanagement. From various States, from rural as well as urban communities, came accounts, some of them elaborated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and detailed, of systematic buying and selling of votes; fraud and demoralization were generally believed to attend the legislative and executive management of federal pensions; and the Indian service was afflicted with the alternating partisan voracity of the two great parties. The most sober and conservative critics of the situation all agreed that it was very unsatisfactory, and that the forces opposed to existing political evils were insufficient, both in numbers and in organization, to cope with them. Could not those forces be marshalled on new lines? Could not more simplicity in directing them to their point of attack be effected? Could not more harmony among themselves be brought about, which would greatly increase their effectiveness, augmenting their numbers and deepening the moral impression their efforts produced upon the public? Such questions naturally presented themselves.

There are many organizations representing various reform elements that might greatly be strengthened by a fuller recognition of the natural relationship which really existed between them. Civil-service reform—probably the most fundamental of all this family—had for twenty years, under the distinguished leadership of George William Curtis, slowly and painfully advanced its line of battle, always holding the ground won, but as yet failing to reach the citadel of the national understanding or the national heart. Thousands of good men who were the natural allies of this the most essential of our political reforms, had their sympathies chilled by the unfortunate coldness and technicality of its name; they failed to perceive its full significance; or they had not the opportunity afforded them of effectively applying their force to its advancement. Ballot-reform associations, Indian-rights associations, municipal committees of one hundred or of fifty, law-and-order leagues, women's health-protective associations, all existed, and, as sharpshooters or small reform detachments, fired their scattering fusillades into the enemy. Good—much good—doubtless was being accomplished, but not enough in view of the attending cost or the boldness of the enemy and his effective organization. The practical, pertinent question which naturally presented itself was, Cannot tenfold the present result be reached if all or most of these scattered groups and societies of reformers, existing unknown to one another and out of touch with one another all over the country, are led to join together, and to mass themselves at some strategic point, some Thermopylæ in which they could, with comparative ease, have the advantage of the enemy?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Consultation and counsel on these points between a few men in Philadelphia and their friends and fellow-workers in New York, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, and other cities, immediately reached practical results. One great idea, one headland of sound theory, rises as a landmark out of the treacherous, fog-veiled sea over which the reform craft sails: a conviction that the present is the era of a reform in American politics, essentially moral in its nature, a reform that, in view of the absurd extremes to which loyalty to party has carried men, urges good citizenship to rally to the defence of principle, as opposed to partisanship, and demands that all methods of political management essentially dishonest and unsound in nature be cast aside; a reform which calls for the destruction of machine politics, and asks that means be devised by which a different class of public men from that which the machine offers can be placed in public office. A higher standard of public service must be established and maintained if American institutions are to give us the practical benefits that their founders sought.

It is interesting to note the enthusiastic assent given to a proposition that seemed to suggest itself,—so spontaneously was it expressed in various localities,—that the American *city* is the reform Thermopylæ, the strategic point to which the fight can be led with the best chance of success. Reform here means reform throughout the country. The important idea which prompted the Conference was the hope that it might lead to some sort of national league among all the cities of the country in which reform elements are at work, which would promote enthusiasm in the cause among all their members, and secure the adoption of the simplest and best methods for obtaining municipal reform; and that other cities still dormant would be encouraged by the existence of such an organization to join it and to adopt accepted lines of work. The great cities, of course, being centres of population, wealth, and power, have become naturally the cradles of political corruption, and for many other reasons, which it is not necessary to discuss here, the effort for good government should be concentrated upon them.

The preliminary steps necessary for holding the Conference were taken in the early days of last summer. The encouragement with which the plan met in various directions, and especially from the City Club of New York, led to the final determination that the project should be carried through. Every effort was made to secure men whose position and ability would give the occasion dignity and weight,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and men from localities sufficiently varied to make the gathering national in its character. These efforts were wholly successful. Many of those who attended the Conference were men of national reputation, and the papers read were of high ability and practical value. New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, Boston, Baltimore, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Albany, Buffalo, Columbus, O., and Philadelphia, were represented. Delegates from New Orleans had set out for the Conference, but because of a failure to make railroad connections they were belated and did not reach Philadelphia in time. It is interesting to note that, when the call for the Conference was issued, preparations were already begun by the workers for good city government in Minneapolis to call a similar national gathering in that city. Without any previous communication or understanding upon the subject, the necessity for the movement was recognized simultaneously by the West and by the East.

The sessions of the Conference were remarkable, both in the character and enthusiasm of the audience. At these meetings about an equal number of men and women were present. The women took the warmest and most appreciative interest in papers and discussions. They represented the best society of Philadelphia, not alone in social position, but in moral and mental force, intelligence, cultivation, and in serious and effective work for the public good. One of the most suggestive papers read was by a woman. A word will be said later as to the influence the Conference is likely to exert upon the public work of women, and, conversely, upon the influence women are likely to exert upon municipal reform.

The most notable and practicable suggestions to be drawn from the facts and opinions presented at the Conference, and which should be held in clear view when treating the topic of its significance, are these:

As was shown conclusively by Mr. Carl Schurz, the foundation for all good city government must be laid in the unhesitating adoption of the principles of civil-service reform: the spoils system must be abolished. The party boss is robbed of his most formidable weapon when he is no longer able to reward his henchmen from the public treasury by the gift of office. Then it is universally admitted that appointive offices are the property of the people, and not of a party; and that partisan tests are no longer to be put to applicants for office, but such tests only as may give reasonable evidence of the applicant's fitness for the place he seeks. Then the character of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entire service will be raised, and we may expect the downfall of the machine. This fundamental suggestion ought to go out in the van of all those uttered at the Conference.

The idea expressed at the Conference which might properly be ranked as second in point of importance is, that in approaching the question of good government in our municipalities we must exclude all discussion of national issues. The stronghold of the boss lies in his power to separate good men into two rival partisan camps, whereas there is no reason why they should not be united in a single body, fighting and working for a single end,—the good of the municipality. It seems astonishing that by so flimsy an expedient the engineers of the machine should be able to keep good citizens—and otherwise sensible men—perpetually quarrelling among themselves, while they and their followers capture the city.

The third practical suggestion to which attention should be especially directed is one naturally growing out of that which precedes it: this was the theme of the last paper presented at the Conference. *A municipal party* should be formed in all American cities, with a view gradually to withdraw the control of city government from the hands of the national parties. This idea is perhaps most fully expressed in the organization of the Municipal League of Philadelphia, a purely municipal party. It invites to its membership all voters, irrespective of their opinions on other matters, who are united in their desire to see the city honestly, efficiently, and economically governed. Of course the action of such a body in the beginning will be the same as that of any body of independents. If not strong enough to nominate its own candidates (and it is not likely at first to be equal to that task in most instances), it will throw its weight with the best candidates of either of the two great parties. After thus winning a few victories it will gather strength, and may, by a consistent and wise course, gradually gain acceptance in the community for its ideas. The soundness of the theory on which its work rests will gradually be accepted, and ultimately it will become master of the situation. The movement of such a municipal party in relation to the other two national parties will be like that of a body of men on the deck of a small steamboat, who, by running in unison from one side of the vessel to the other, produce an increasing oscillation which ends by capsizing the boat. The municipal party aims to capsize the partisan craft, which, so far as the city's affairs are concerned, the national parties represent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such is a summary of the essential suggestions set forth by the Conference: the abolition of the spoils system; the exclusion of national issues from city affairs, and hence the crippling of the party machine; and the creation of a single municipal party. But, of course, these results cannot be obtained without a complete revolution in the attitude which the general public now maintains toward political questions. Present apathy must give way to future interest. With an awakened sense of individual obligation to the public welfare, citizens will acquire knowledge of the needs of the situation and of the steps necessary to meet them; and each will be willing, under wise leadership, to contribute his share of thought, money, and time to redeem his city from the curse of bad government. Quite enough suggestion has been furnished by the Conference to indicate the main lines along which we must advance to gain the desired end. None can plead necessary confusion, or ignorance, on that point. The main questions that now need to be answered are moral ones: Are we convinced of the seriousness of the situation? Shall we make the sacrifices which the cause demands?

Before speaking, in conclusion, of the provision made by the Conference for the propagation of its ideas and the continuance of its work, a word may well be spoken of the indications given at the first gathering in Philadelphia, of the great part which women are likely to take in the cause of municipal reform. In no small degree was the success of the Conference due to the work of intelligent, experienced, and enthusiastic women. Their aid was invoked in order to render the effort successful, and they responded to the appeal in various practical ways. They made the "better half" of the audience as might be expected; they contributed materially to the discussions; they added an obvious social charm, and supplied an atmosphere of enthusiastic interest to the meetings. But these are mere indications of what may in the future be expected of cultivated and intelligent women in the cause of good city government. Women are needed,—and if their efforts are guided wisely they may become invaluable allies in this work. The task of municipal reform is likely to exercise a strong influence upon the women who engage in it; it will teach them the self-restraint necessary to those who work effectively in organized bodies, and will develop unsuspected powers of public usefulness. It will prepare the way for the next step,—the franchise for women in political matters. What they have already effected in education, in the work of college-settlements, in the line of munici-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pal sanitation, and in kindred efforts, gives augury of their success in the more direct political work of the municipal problem. The indications on this point given by the Philadelphia Conference are worthy of the serious consideration of municipal reformers in other cities. The Civic Club of Philadelphia, an organization of women, constituted especially with a view to undertake municipal work, but which was in existence previous to the time of the national meeting in Philadelphia, has been greatly stimulated by it.

The Conference before adjourning appointed, through its chairman, Mr. James C. Carter of New York, a committee of seven, charged with the duty of forming a National League for Good City Government, with a view to creating a strong organization throughout the country. Of this committee the writer has the honor to be chairman. This item of information is furnished in case readers of this article should have need of communication with the committee. The papers and proceedings of the Conference are being published. A constitution has been prepared and adopted by the committee, which it is proposed to present for acceptance to the various organizations that may reasonably be expected to feel an interest in the work of municipal reform, and that are likely to be able to assist in its attainment. It is proposed to hold meetings of the League, at suitable intervals, in various cities of the country, with a view to the wide dissemination of knowledge, the awakening of interest and enthusiasm in the cause of the good government of American cities,—a cause which, in our judgment, bears perhaps more strongly than any other at the present time upon the welfare of American free institutions, and touches more potently than any other the fate of representative government. Whether this movement to reform our cities will accomplish all that is predicted and hoped for it; whether it will prove to have marked out the lines for a new and larger combination of those forces which, springing out of the higher aspirations of the American people, aim to control base and dangerous tendencies,—remains to be seen. It is not too much to claim, however, that the movement creates a new opportunity. It remains for us to prove that it shall not be an opportunity wasted.

HERBERT WELSH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IRISH CONQUEST OF OUR CITIES.

THE mayor of New York, a few years ago, was introduced to an audience of Irishmen in a Boston theatre by the mayor of Boston, to deliver an address on "The Irish Race in America." It happened that the mayor of New York and the mayor of Boston were both Irishmen. If the mayors and other officials of most of the other important cities of the United States had been present, their welcome would have been as appropriate and as hearty; for one of the functions of the Irish race in America is to administer the affairs of American cities. Now the Irishman in America is patriotic, and he is entitled to his due share in our government. But the theory of the government contemplates the rule of the majority, and in the cities of the United States a minority has so long been in control that it will require a veritable revolution to shake off, even for a time, the dominion of our Hibernian oligarchy. Were this minority made up of direct immigrants from an angelic world, its right to rule the majority would be clearly indefensible.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the Irish in America constitute a small percentage of the population. If the immigration from Ireland to the colonies in the seventeenth century be roughly estimated at 100,000, there are good reasons for believing that during the eighteenth century there arrived not more than 500,000 souls. The arrivals in the United States from Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century were probably not less than 2,000,000. In the ten years ending in 1880, 379,368 Irish immigrants landed at the port of New York alone, the census of 1880 declaring that there were then in the United States 1,854,571 persons of Irish birth. In the ten years closing with 1890 the arrivals in all the ports of the United States from Ireland were 655,381, and the number of citizens of Irish birth who came to this country in the fifty years from 1840 to 1890 has been by some experts put down at about 3,250,000. In the mean time, the sons of these citizens of Irish birth, being themselves native-born, have shown an hereditary aptitude for securing such offices as those of alderman, councilman, policeman, municipal clerk, bureau-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chief, and mayor. They have entered the race with unflagging effort and unfailing success.

In the five great cities of New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston more than one-fourth of these new-comers find homes. More than one-half of them settle in fifty of the principal cities of the United States. They seek the centres of population, and a distinguished New-Yorker of Irish descent estimated, as long ago as 1886, that more than a seventh of the entire population of that city was of Irish birth. The conditions in which the most of them lived when the census of 1880 was taken were such that the death-rate among Irish-New-Yorkers was 28.02, while among German-New-Yorkers it was 19.96 and among English-New-Yorkers, 20.90. If the proposition that the Irish-New-Yorkers govern the rest of the New-Yorkers be established, and if it be established, too, that they rule the other leading cities of America, the sanitary condition of the Irish-New-Yorkers, who send forth colonies of their countrymen to other cities, becomes important to the whole country. Mayor Grace himself, on the occasion referred to, said that he fully recognized the poverty and wretchedness of most of the tenement Irish in New York. Moreover, the Irish-American almost invariably becomes the father of voters, and it is safe to say that his sons never fail to vote on the first election day after their majority.

To what extent is it true that this minority of Irish-Americans rules the leading cities of the United States? Among the cities led captive by Irishmen and their sons, are New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Hoboken, Boston, Chicago, Buffalo, Albany, Troy, Pittsburg, St. Paul, St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, New Orleans, and San Francisco. The fact that Brooklyn, Buffalo, and Jersey City have recently thrown off their yoke does not remove them from the list. They bore it for years and may bear it again. In Philadelphia, Indianapolis, and Providence, the Irish electors have divided and failed to conquer. Were they as solidly united there as in New York, Brooklyn, Boston, and Chicago, they would be as successful. In the smaller cities of New England and the South there is an interesting continuance of the habit of electing members of the substantial old American families to office. It is in the cities of the Atlantic seaboard that the Irishman begins the process of becoming an American; that he finds office-holding, in person or by proxy, both easy and profitable. To Chicago he gravitates naturally, the seaboard once left behind; and Pittsburg and Buffalo are stages on the journey.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Chicago he pushes on toward San Francisco, pausing the while to test his prowess in Detroit, Omaha, Denver, St. Paul, and Minneapolis. Milwaukee and Cincinnati are yet German-American strongholds.

The complete rule of the Irish for long periods is susceptible of ready demonstration in New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Jersey City, and Pittsburg. This fact alone warrants a general municipal house-cleaning in the United States, such as Brooklyn and Buffalo have recently had.

The men who chiefly control the affairs of New York city in the year of grace 1894 are Richard Croker, Thomas F. Gilroy, Bernard F. Martin, and James J. Martin. They were all born in Ireland. These four are just now the most influential men in determining the destiny of the metropolis. They select its public servants. They assign to their respective berths those citizens deemed worthy of official recognition, whether it be on the police force, in the street-cleaning brigade, in the vast bureaus of the municipal service, in the Board of Aldermen, in the State Legislature at Albany, or the National Legislature at Washington. This, of course, is a mere platitude, so well is it known and so many times is it asserted every day. New York has ceased to be an interesting study for municipal experts. It is clean given over to Irish domination.

Richard Croker was born in Ireland about fifty-three years ago. To the Fassett Investigating Committee he testified that he was not "an American born," but he failed to say just where and when he was born. It was, however, somewhere in Ireland. The newspapers of New York city freely concede to Mr. Croker a practical dictatorship of its affairs. Thus, a little while ago, one said:

"Just now he has selected his candidates for State senators, which amounts to saying that he has appointed the nine men to represent the city in the highest branch of the Legislature."

Another:

"He is the dispenser of place in our municipal government. He decides what laws shall be enacted by the State Legislature. He determines who shall be our judges, magistrates, and commissioners. His permission is a necessary first step toward the entrance of men into Congress. . . . In conjunction with Mr. McLaughlin of Brooklyn, Mr. Murphy of Troy, Mr. Hill of Albany, and Mr. Sheehan of Buffalo, he selects the senators to represent in Congress the greatest State in the Union."

Another says:

"No President ever had such power in Congress. . . . Richard Croker is virtually the law-making power."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mayor Thomas F. Gilroy was born in Ireland in 1840. Like Richard Croker, he came to America as a lad. On reaching his majority he decided that office-holding was the best career for him to pursue, and he has pursued it ever since, with marked success. Unlike Mr. Croker, whose only important office in New York has been the office of city chamberlain, Mr. Gilroy has held his offices in person. He began as clerk in the Croton Aqueduct Department. Next he became clerk of the Supreme Court, then clerk of the Senate Railroad Committee, then of the Joint Railroad Committee, then of the District Court in the Annexed District, then of the Ninth District Court. Mr. Gilroy soon became deputy county clerk under James Flack, afterward sheriff. Mr. Gilroy was his under-sheriff, and next became commissioner of public works, and then mayor. As to this lucky succession of offices of various kinds, all that need be said is that he wanted them and he got them. He was, of course, a consistent and active factor in the political organization known as Tammany Hall, to which most of the Irish-New-Yorkers give their allegiance.

James J. Martin, president of the board of police commissioners, in which he is assisted by Messrs. Sheehan, McClave, and MacLean, was born in Ireland in 1846. He emigrated with his parents at the age of two. He began his office-holding career as a clerk in the finance department, and he has kept right on holding offices ever since. His brother, Bernard F. Martin, also, who is now a judge on the bench of one of the New York police courts, has been a consistent, industrious, and successful office-holder.

Mr. William Bourke Cockran, whose former law-partner, Mr. William H. Clark, is corporation counsel to the municipality of New York, was once mentioned among the chief rulers of the city. This was a year or two ago, before he is supposed to have made a declaration of personal independence. Mr. Cockran was born in county Sligo, Ireland, February 28, 1854. Mr. Cockran is in Congress now, where yet he finds few of his fellow-countrymen; for the State legislature has thus far, as a rule, been the climax of the legislative career of the Irish-American citizen in the first and second generation. Edward Murphy, Jr., of Troy, N. Y., however, helps to misrepresent the Empire State in the United States Senate, although his election would have been an impossibility had the recent flagrant crimes against the franchise in his pocket borough been committed in advance of his candidacy.

Joseph J. O'Donohue is city chamberlain of New York. Re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

corder Smyth, chief criminal judge, is an Irishman. Mr. Thomas F. Byrnes, superintendent of the New York police force, is put down by his biographers as born in New York. He comes of Irish stock, of course. So do most of the police officers whose names appear in the public prints. The roster of the officials of New York city is too long to print here. Among the conspicuous office-holders are: Three other Crokers and five other relatives of Mr. Richard Croker; two other Gilroys, three Purroys, three Fitzgeralds, three Sextons, two Sullivans, one Shea, two Divvers, two Scannells, five Fitzpatricks, three Dalys, two Murphys, two Kehoes, three Keatings, three Crays, a Burke, a McMullin, four Ryans, a McInerney, and a Fallon or two. The simple reading of the roll should send a thrill of joy through the bones of the Irish kings.

Brooklyn affords to the student of municipal office-holders the most interesting possible study. While in New York the Irish-American minority rules by dividing the offices among its own leaders, in Brooklyn the office-holders were for many years for the most part native Americans. Yet in no other city in the world did men of Irish birth obtain and hold such powers and grow so rich by their perquisites. The Irish-Brooklynites have kept themselves in the background, holding office only long enough to lay the foundations for those individual fortunes which the efforts of others were thenceforward to build up. Mr. Charles A. Schieren, the recently elected mayor of Brooklyn, was born in Hesse-Cassel. He was elected as a Republican and reformer. His predecessor, Mr. David A. Boody, who served the Irish-American oligarchy, was born in Maine. His predecessor, who served the same masters, was Alfred C. Chapin, born in Massachusetts. His predecessor, D. D. Whitney, a Long Islander, was equally subservient to the famous McLaughlin régime. The unofficial coterie of Brooklyn municipal bosses headed by McLaughlin were born in Ireland with one or two exceptions, and it has long been and is one of the most remarkable oligarchies ever known. Its leader, Hugh McLaughlin, the son of Irish parents, was born in Brooklyn in 1825. His word has been law in the politics of his native city since 1855, with occasional intervals like the present. McLaughlin is the original American "boss." The others of the coterie are James Shevlin, born in county Monahan, Ireland; Henry H. Adams, who was city treasurer, born in Londonderry; Anthony Barrett, born in county Mayo; Michael J. Coffey, born in Limerick; John Delmar, Thomas F. Nevins, James McGarry, James Kane,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Thomas J. Kenna, all born in Ireland; P. H. McCarren, born in Massachusetts; John McCarthy, born in Westchester County, New York; and W. A. Furey. For nearly twenty years these men taxed and directed and managed the affairs of the citizens of Brooklyn. They grew rich of course. The only offices they cared to hold were those of register, sheriff, and county clerk, each of which was reckoned to be worth from $40,000 to $60,000 a year. Under Mayors Chapin and Boody they had things their own way. The Mayor's Cabinet, as it is called, was practically the same under their two administrations, consisting of City Works Commissioner John P. Adams, born in Essex County, Mass.; Police Commissioner H. I. Hayden, born in New Haven; Dr. John Griffen, Health Commissioner, who was born in Ireland in 1845; Park Commissioner George V. Brower, born in New Jersey; Tax Collector Alden S. Swan, born in Massachusetts; John Ennis, Fire Commissioner, born in Ireland; Excise Commissioners John W. Cahill, Irish, and John Schliemann, Prussian; and Corporation Counsel Almet F. Jenks, a native of Brooklyn.

Yet with all this great show of native office-holders, the civil list of the city of Brooklyn on January 1, 1894, showed such an astonishing array of McLaughlins, McCloskeys, Mahoneys, Reillys, Rorkes, Shaughnessys, Kellys, Finnegans, Noonans, Corcorans, O'Rourkes, McCormicks, Fitzpatricks, Farrells, Murphys, Dunns, Mooneys, McGarrys, Quinns, Brennans, McDermotts, Murthas, Haggertys, O'Flynns, O'Donohues, Kerrigans, McCanns, Meaneys, Gradys, McNamaras, Phelans, O'Connors, Lynches, O'Tooles, Keenans, and the like, that it is strange not to read first in the requirements for office proof of the birth of the candidate, or of his father, in the land of Erin. A simple perusal of the civil lists of the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City tells the story of the *personnel* of our municipal government.

The Irish-American "ring" in Jersey City, N. J., was recently broken, for the time being at least, by the election of Peter F. Wanser as mayor. But its hold on the offices and on the revenues of the citizens is still strong. Irish-Americans have indeed for several decades governed New Jersey, from Trenton as well as in Jersey City, Camden, Hoboken, and other towns. The race-track bosses, whose shameful control of legislation of the State capital caused a popular uprising last year, are dominated by Irishmen. Mr. William P. Thompson, *alias* "Billy," *alias* "the Duke of Gloucester," whose sway was corrupt and absolute for years, glories in being

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"an Irishman." Even the "reform" mayor of Hoboken is Mr. "Larry" Fagan. The bosses of New York have helped to intrench smaller bosses of their own nationality in nearly all the adjacent towns.

In Boston the Irish-American voters have for a decade been about half of the total registered voters. They nearly all vote, and they have consequently controlled the city. In 1884–85 Hugh O'Brien, Irish-born, was elected mayor. The present mayor, Mr. Matthews, was the candidate of the Irish-Bostonians. The total registration is never much more than 65,000; the total vote is rarely more than 55,000, and the Democratic majority is generally about 10,000 in State elections, and from 5,000 to 6,000 in city elections. This difference, of at least 4,000, indicates the number of Democrats who will not vote for Irish mayors and aldermen. Mr. Matthews has been elected four times in succession. There is a Boston "Boss," who is called "Mike," and several of the aldermen, who were poor men, have blossomed into luxury. It is interesting to note the fact that while the natives are outnumbered by the foreign voters of Boston, if the women held the suffrage there would be a majority of about 50,000 native-born voters. The civil list of Boston will repay instructive study.

The Irish domination of the municipal government of Chicago has been conceded for some years. It reached its highest development under the late Carter Harrison. Mayor Cregier owed much to the Irish-Chicagoans, and the city's civil list offers almost as startling revelations as the lists of New York and Brooklyn office-holders. The murder of Dr. Patrick Cronin by fellow-countrymen of diverging opinions has thrown light on the unofficial coterie of Irish-Chicagoan bosses, and revealed the tremendous influence that Alexander Sullivan wields among them. The late Mayor Harrison's death at the hands of an Irish assassin caused the election of John P. Hopkins, a native of Buffalo. His secretary sends me the following list of the mayor's subordinates: The present chief of police of Chicago, M. Brennan, was born in Ireland fifty-two years ago; the city treasurer, M. J. Branfield, was born in Ireland forty-six years ago; the chief of detectives, John D. Shea, was born in Cook County, Ill., forty-six years ago (evidently of Irish parents); the commissioner of public works, H. J. Jones, was born in New Hampshire fifty-eight years ago, and the city attorney, George A. Trude, in Lockport, N. Y., twenty-seven years ago.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That San Francisco, the chief city of the Pacific Coast, situated at the width of the continent away from the chief Irish *entrepôt*, should fall so completely under the sway of the oligarchy, is at first surprising. But for years the city has been the prey of Christopher A. Buckley, *alias* "the Blind White Devil," *alias* "Irish Chris." Mr. Buckley was born in Ireland, and, like most successful Irish-American bosses, came to his future domain at an early age. He landed in New York, and went westward. He opened a saloon in San Francisco, became a ward boss, lost his eyesight, widened and deepened his influence on the municipality, and for the decade ending in 1890 ruled it with a rod of iron. The usual Hibernization of the police force and the city departments promptly followed. Jerry Driscoll was his lieutenant, and his word was law in the City Hall. He made an enormous fortune and put Daniel T. Murphy on the bench. The present mayor of San Francisco is Mr. L. R. Ellert. But the chief of police, who has served as "constable, school-marshal, commissioner of the Marine Board, and commissioner to condemn land," is Mr. Patrick Crowley.

Salt Lake City is a little off the line of Irish migration, and has grown to importance under peculiar conditions of citizenship. But even here the chief of detectives is John J. Donovan.

The secretary of the mayor of Pittsburg sends me the following information: the mayor, Bernard McKenna, was born in that city fifty-two years ago (of Irish parentage?); the chief of detectives, Roger O'Mara, was born in Ireland fifty years ago; the other officers were born either in Pittsburg or near by.

From the office of the mayor of Buffalo come the names of Charles F. Bishop, of Erie County, mayor; James Mooney, born in Ireland, commissioner of public works (with two others, born in the State of New York); Frank C. Laughlin, corporation counsel, born in New York (of Irish parentage); George Chambers, of Buffalo, chief of police; and Robert Oehning, of Germany, city treasurer. It is in Buffalo that the notorious Irish-American boss, William F. Sheehan, one of the dispensers of the patronage of the State of New York, has achieved such prominence as an organizer of a political machine. Whenever the local affairs of Buffalo or New York city come before the legislature at Albany, the Irish-American machine becomes conspicuous in the legislature. Otherwise the State government might escape it for the most part. It is doubtful, by the way, if an Irish-American could have himself elected (he prefers to elect an American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partner) governor of New York. Outside of the cities there are few Irish-American electors.

In Philadelphia two famous bosses for many years were Squire McManus, a Democratic, and James McManes, a Republican Irish-American. Their word was law to their respective factions, and practically to their parties. Smaller bosses of Irish descent clustered about them. It now happens that every prominent office-holder in Philadelphia, from Mayor Edwin S. Stuart down, was born in Pennsylvania. Yet it will not be maintained by an independent Philadelphian that his city is free from Irish-American influences. Its politics has been held up to scorn for decades.

With F. P. Wright of Pittsburg for mayor, St. Paul's municipal roster, as officially reported, includes Albert Garvin, chief of police; R. L. Gorman, president of the board of public works, and John C. McGinn, chief of detectives. Clearly the Irish-American has made himself felt in St. Paul.

The offices of chief of police and chief of detectives seem to fall to the lot of Irishmen even in cities so essentially German-American as Cincinnati. In Seattle, the chief of detectives is named Edward Cudihee; in Indianapolis, Tim Splan, who was "born in Ireland," is the chief; in Cincinnati, Larry Hazen, who was "born in Ireland" sixty-three years ago. In Milwaukee, after Mayor Koch, who was born in Germany, Chief of Police Janssen, Treasurer Steinman, Comptroller Czerwinski, and Chief of Detectives Riemer, comes Commissioner of Public Works Patrick Drew, "born in Ireland." A congress of the police officials of the United States would exhibit a stalwart array of Irishmen, and a convention of their subordinates might chill the blood of the British lion. If there is ever an army needed to free Ireland, there ought to be no trouble to raise it, already uniformed, in the cities of the United States.

In New Orleans John Fitzpatrick is mayor, and the police force has long been under Irish control. Mr. Noonan, who was mayor of St. Louis, has recently been succeeded by Mr. Walbridge, but the Irish-American machine is full of vigor in St. Louis to-day. The chief of police is Mr. Lawrence Harrigan, "born in Ireland;" the chief of detectives is Mr. William Desmond; and the director of public works is Mr. Robert E. McMath. The mayor of Dubuque is Mr. Dougherty; of Fall River, Mr. Coughlin; of Holyoke, Mr. Dennis Farr; of Los Angeles, Mr. Rowan; of Rochester, Mr. Curran; of Savannah, Mr. McDonough; of Scranton, Mr. Connell, and of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Troy, Mr. Dennis Whelan. The chief of detectives of Kansas City is Mr. Moran; the director of public works, Mr. Peter H. Tiernan. To extend the list it may be added that the "Police and Prison Cyclopædia," published last year, shows that the chiefs of police in the following cities and towns have decidedly Irish names: Atlanta, Ga.; Brooklyn, N. Y.; Burlington, Ia.; Cairo, Ill.; Carbondale, Pa.; Cincinnati, O.; Dayton, O.; Denver, Col.; Duluth, Minn.; East St. Louis, Ill.; Eau Claire, Wis.; Haverhill, Mass.; Joliet, Ill.; La Crosse, Wis.; Lawrence, Mass.; Manchester, N. H.; Melrose, Mass.; Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Oswego, N. Y.; Passaic, N. J.; Portsmouth, Va.; Pueblo, Col.; Quincy, Ill.; Saginaw, Mich.; San Francisco, Cal.; Spokane, Wash.; Trenton, N. J.; Waterbury, Conn.

In Baltimore every city official now in office was born in that city, of which Mr. Latrobe, who has held his office seven times, is mayor. In cities that are situated in the more remote parts of the country, out of the route of Irish migration, the chief officials are yet native Americans—as, for instance, Bangor, Me., Richmond, Va., and Mobile, Ala. Our municipal conquerors, therefore, have yet some territory unsubdued.

But there ought not, after these somewhat monotonous roll-calls, to be any doubt that the Irish in America have a genius for municipal government—at least for getting municipal offices. They crop up constantly in the most unexpected places. John Y. McKane, the recently convicted tyrant of Gravesend, in New York, and now in Sing Sing prison, who was a Republican one year and a Democrat the next, was born in Ireland. His disgrace is no greater than his deserts.

What do the majorities of the citizens of American municipalities think of themselves? How has it come about that the system of government so admirably conceived by the fathers has worked out so perfectly in national affairs and so poorly in municipal affairs? Philadelphia, Boston, and New York were once governed by the Quakers, the Puritans, and the Knickerbockers. Are they better governed now, since from the turbulence of municipal politics the Irish-American has plucked both wealth and power? Surely those who are too scrupulous to contest with him for those rewards should be the last to decry him for his success in securing them.

JOHN PAUL BOCOCK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT "AMERICANISM" MEANS.

PATRIOTISM was once defined as "the last refuge of a scoundrel;" and somebody has recently remarked that when Dr. Johnson gave this definition he was ignorant of the infinite possibilities contained in the word "reform." Of course both gibes were quite justifiable, in so far as they were aimed at people who use noble names to cloak base purposes. Equally of course the man shows little wisdom and a low sense of duty who fails to see that love of country is one of the elemental virtues, even though scoundrels play upon it for their own selfish ends; and, inasmuch as abuses continually grow up in civic life as in all other kinds of life, the statesman is indeed a weakling who hesitates to reform these abuses because the word "reform" is often on the lips of men who are silly or dishonest.

What is true of patriotism and reform is true also of Americanism. There are plenty of scoundrels always ready to try to belittle reform movements or to bolster up existing iniquities in the name of Americanism; but this does not alter the fact that the man who can do most in this country is and must be the man whose Americanism is most sincere and intense. Outrageous though it is to use a noble idea as the cloak for evil, it is still worse to assail the noble idea itself because it can thus be used. The men who do iniquity in the name of patriotism, of reform, of Americanism, are merely one small division of the class that has always existed and will always exist,—the class of hypocrites and demagogues, the class that is always prompt to steal the watchwords of righteousness and use them in the interests of evil-doing.

The stoutest and truest Americans are the very men who have the least sympathy with the people who invoke the spirit of Americanism to aid what is vicious in our government, or to throw obstacles in the way of those who strive to reform it. It is contemptible to oppose a movement for good because that movement has already succeeded somewhere else, or to champion an existing abuse because our people have always been wedded to it. To appeal to national prejudice against a given reform movement is in every way unworthy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and silly. It is as childish to denounce free trade because England has adopted it as to advocate it for the same reason. It is eminently proper, in dealing with the tariff, to consider the effect of tariff legislation in time past upon other nations as well as the effect upon our own; but in drawing conclusions it is in the last degree foolish to try to excite prejudice against one system because it is in vogue in some given country, or to try to excite prejudice in its favor because the economists of that country have found that it was suited to their own peculiar needs. In attempting to solve our difficult problem of municipal government it is mere folly to refuse to profit by whatever is good in the examples of Manchester and Berlin because these cities are foreign, exactly as it is mere folly blindly to copy their examples without reference to our own totally different conditions. As for the absurdity of declaiming against civil-service reform, for instance, as "Chinese," because written examinations have been used in China, it would be quite as wise to declaim against gunpowder because it was first utilized by the same people. In short, the man who, whether from mere dull fatuity or from an active interest in misgovernment, tries to appeal to American prejudice against things foreign, so as to induce Americans to oppose any measure for good, should be looked on by his fellow-countrymen with the heartiest contempt. So much for the men who appeal to the spirit of Americanism to sustain us in wrong-doing. But we must never let our contempt for these men blind us to the nobility of the idea which they strive to degrade.

We Americans have many grave problems to solve, many threatening evils to fight, and many deeds to do, if, as we hope and believe, we have the wisdom, the strength, the courage, and the virtue to do them. But we must face facts as they are. We must neither surrender ourselves to a foolish optimism, nor succumb to a timid and ignoble pessimism. Our nation is that one among all the nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years. We enjoy exceptional advantages, and are menaced by exceptional dangers; and all signs indicate that we shall either fail greatly or succeed greatly. I firmly believe that we shall succeed; but we must not foolishly blink the dangers by which we are threatened, for that is the way to fail. On the contrary, we must soberly set to work to find out all we can about the existence and extent of every evil, must acknowledge it to be such, and must then attack it with unyielding resolution. There are many such evils, and each must be fought after a separate fashion; yet there is one quality which we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must bring to the solution of every problem,—that is, an intense and fervid Americanism. We shall never be successful over the dangers that confront us; we shall never achieve true greatness, nor reach the lofty ideal which the founders and preservers of our mighty Federal Republic have set before us, unless we are Americans in heart and soul, in spirit and purpose, keenly alive to the responsibility implied in the very name of American, and proud beyond measure of the glorious privilege of bearing it.

There are two or three sides to the question of Americanism, and two or three senses in which the word "Americanism" can be used to express the antithesis of what is unwholesome and undesirable. In the first place we wish to be broadly American and national, as opposed to being local or sectional. We do not wish, in politics, in literature, or in art, to develop that unwholesome parochial spirit, that over-exaltation of the little community at the expense of the great nation, which produces what has been described as the patriotism of the village, the patriotism of the belfry. Politically, the indulgence of this spirit was the chief cause of the calamities which befell the ancient republics of Greece, the mediæval republics of Italy, and the petty States of Germany as it was in the last century. It is this spirit of provincial patriotism, this inability to take a view of broad adhesion to the whole nation that has been the chief among the causes that have produced such anarchy in the South American States, and which have resulted in presenting to us, not one great Spanish-American federal nation stretching from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, but a squabbling multitude of revolution-ridden States, not one of which stands even in the second rank as a power. However, politically this question of American nationality has been settled once for all. We are no longer in danger of repeating in our history the shameful and contemptible disasters that have befallen the Spanish possessions on this continent since they threw off the yoke of Spain. Indeed there is, all through our life, very much less of this parochial spirit than there was formerly. Still there is an occasional outcropping here and there; and it is just as well that we should keep steadily in mind the futility of talking of a Northern literature or a Southern literature, an Eastern or a Western school of art or science. The "Sewanee Review" and the "Overland Monthly," like the "Century" and the "Atlantic," do good work, not merely for one section of the country, but for American literature as a whole. Their success really means as much for Americans who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happen to live in New York or Boston as for Americans who happen to live in the Gulf States or on the Pacific slope. Joel Chandler Harris is emphatically a national writer; so is Mark Twain. They do not write merely for Georgia or Missouri, any more than for Illinois or Connecticut; they write as Americans and for all people who can read English. It is of very great consequence that we should have a full and ripe literary development in the United States, but it is not of the least consequence whether New York, or Boston, or Chicago, or San Francisco becomes the literary centre of the United States.

There is a second side to this question of a broad Americanism, however. The patriotism of the village or the belfry is bad, but the lack of all patriotism is even worse. There are philosophers who assure us that, in the future, patriotism will be regarded not as a virtue at all, but merely as a mental stage in the journey toward a state of feeling when our patriotism will include the whole human race and all the world. This may be so; but the age of which these philosophers speak is still several æons distant. In fact, philosophers of this type are so very advanced that they are of no practical service to the present generation. It may be that in ages so remote that we cannot now understand any of the feelings of those who will dwell in them, patriotism will no longer be regarded as a virtue, exactly as it may be that in those remote ages people will look down upon and disregard monogamic marriage; but as things now are and have been for two or three thousand years past, and are likely to be for two or three thousand years to come, the words "home" and "country" mean a great deal. Nor do they show any tendency to lose their significance. At present, treason, like adultery, ranks as one of the worst of all possible crimes.

One may fall very far short of treason and yet be an undesirable citizen in the community. The man who becomes Europeanized, who loses his power of doing good work on this side of the water, and who loses his love for his native land, is not a traitor; but he is a silly and undesirable citizen. He is as emphatically a noxious element in our body politic as is the man who comes here from abroad and remains a foreigner. Nothing will more quickly or more surely disqualify a man from doing good work in the world than the acquirement of that flaccid habit of mind which its possessors style cosmopolitanism.

It is not only necessary to Americanize the immigrants of foreign birth who settle among us, but it is even more necessary for those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among us who are by birth and descent already Americans not to throw away our birthright, and, with incredible and contemptible folly, wander back to bow down before the alien gods whom our forefathers forsook. It is hard to believe that there is any necessity to warn Americans that, when they seek to model themselves on the lines of other civilizations, they make themselves the butts of all right-thinking men; and yet the necessity certainly exists to give this warning to many of our citizens who pride themselves on their standing in the world of art and letters, or, perchance, on what they would style their social leadership in the community. It is always better to be an original than an imitation, even when the imitation is of something better than the original; but what shall we say of the fool who is content to be an imitation of something worse? Even if the weaklings who seek to be other than Americans were right in deeming other nations to be better than their own, the fact yet remains that to be a first-class American is fifty-fold better than to be a second-class imitation of a Frenchman or Englishman. As a matter of fact, however, those of our countrymen who do believe in American inferiority are always individuals who, however cultivated, have some organic weakness in their moral or mental make-up; and the great mass of our people, who are robustly patriotic, and who have sound, healthy minds, are justified in regarding these feeble renegades with a half-impatient and half-amused scorn.

We believe in waging relentless war on rank-growing evils of all kinds, and it makes no difference to us if they happen to be of purely native growth. We grasp at any good, no matter whence it comes. We do not accept the evil attendant upon another system of government as an adequate excuse for that attendant upon our own; the fact that the courtier is a scamp does not render the demagogue any the less a scoundrel. But it remains true that, in spite of all our faults and shortcomings, no other land offers such glorious possibilities to the man able to take advantage of them, as does ours; it remains true that no one of our people can do any work really worth doing unless he does it primarily as an American. It is because certain classes of our people still retain their spirit of colonial dependence on, and exaggerated deference to, European opinion, that they fail to accomplish what they ought to. It is precisely along the lines where we have worked most independently that we have accomplished the greatest results; and it is in those professions where there has been no servility to, but merely a wise profiting by, foreign ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perience, that we have produced our greatest men. Our soldiers and statesmen and orators; our explorers, our wilderness-winners and commonwealth-builders; the men who have made our laws and seen that they were executed; and the other men whose energy and ingenuity have created our marvellous material prosperity,—all these have been men who have drawn wisdom from the experience of every age and nation, but who have nevertheless thought, and worked, and conquered, and lived, and died, purely as Americans; and on the whole they have done better work than has been done in any other country during the short period of our national life.

On the other hand, it is in those professions where our people have striven hardest to mould themselves in conventional European forms that they have succeeded least; and this holds true to the present day, the failure being of course most conspicuous where the man takes up his abode in Europe; where he becomes a second-rate European, because he is over-civilized, over-sensitive, over-refined, and has lost the hardihood and manly courage by which alone he can conquer in the keen struggle of our national life. Be it remembered, too, that this same being does not really become a European; he only ceases being an American, and becomes nothing. He throws away a great prize for the sake of a lesser one, and does not even get the lesser one. The painter who goes to Paris, not merely to get two or three years' thorough training in his art, but with the deliberate purpose of taking up his abode there, and with the intention of following in the ruts worn deep by ten thousand earlier travellers, instead of striking off to rise or fall on a new line, thereby forfeits all chance of doing the best work. He must content himself with aiming at that kind of mediocrity which consists in doing fairly well what has already been done better; and he usually never even sees the grandeur and picturesqueness lying open before the eyes of every man who can read the book of America's past and the book of America's present. Thus it is with the undersized man of letters, who flees his country because he, with his delicate, effeminate sensitiveness, finds the conditions of life on this side of the water crude and raw; in other words, because he finds that he cannot play a man's part among men, and so goes where he will be sheltered from the winds that harden stouter souls. This *emigré* may write graceful and pretty verses, essays, novels; but he will never do work to compare with that of his brother, who is strong enough to stand on his own feet, and do his work as an American. Thus it is with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scientist who spends his youth in a German university, and can thenceforth work only in the fields already fifty times furrowed by the German ploughs. Thus it is with that most foolish of parents who sends his children to be educated abroad, not knowing—what every clear-sighted man from Washington and Jay down has known—that the American who is to make his way in America should be brought up among his fellow Americans. It is among the people who like to consider themselves, and, indeed, to a large extent are, the leaders of the so-called social world, especially in some of the northeastern cities, that this colonial habit of thought, this thoroughly provincial spirit of admiration for things foreign, and inability to stand on one's own feet, becomes most evident and most despicable. We thoroughly believe in every kind of honest and lawful pleasure, so long as the getting it is not made man's chief business; and we believe heartily in the good that can be done by men of leisure who work hard in their leisure, whether at politics or philanthropy, literature or art. But a leisure class whose leisure simply means idleness is a curse to the community, and in so far as its members distinguish themselves chiefly by aping the worst—not the best—traits of similar people across the water, they become both comic and noxious elements of the body politic.

The third sense in which the word "Americanism" may be employed is with reference to the Americanizing of the newcomers to our shores. We must Americanize them in every way, in speech, in political ideas and principles, and in their way of looking at the relations between Church and State. We welcome the German or the Irishman who becomes an American. We have no use for the German or Irishman who remains such. We do not wish German-Americans and Irish-Americans who figure as such in our social and political life; we want only Americans, and, provided they are such, we do not care whether they are of native or of Irish or of German ancestry. We have no room in any healthy American community for a German-American vote or an Irish-American vote, and it is contemptible demagogy to put planks into any party platform with the purpose of catching such a vote. We have no room for any people who do not act and vote simply as Americans, and as nothing else. Moreover, we have as little use for people who carry religious prejudices into our politics as for those who carry prejudices of caste or nationality. We stand unalterably in favor of the public-school system in its entirety. We believe that the English, and no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other language, is that in which all the school exercises should be conducted. We are against any division of the school fund, and against any appropriation of public money for sectarian purposes. We are against any recognition whatever by the State in any shape or form of State-aided parochial schools. But we are equally opposed to any discrimination against or for a man because of his creed. We demand that all citizens, Protestant and Catholic, Jew and Gentile, shall have fair treatment in every way; that all alike shall have their rights guaranteed them. The very reasons that make us unqualified in our opposition to State-aided sectarian schools make us equally bent that, in the management of our public schools, the adherents of each creed shall be given exact and equal justice, wholly without regard to their religious affiliations; that trustees, superintendents, teachers, scholars, all alike, shall be treated without any reference whatsoever to the creed they profess. We maintain that it is an outrage, in voting for a man for any position, whether State or national, to take into account his religious faith, provided only he is a good American. When a secret society does what in some places the American Protective Association seems to have done, and tries to proscribe Catholics both politically and socially, the members of such society show that they themselves are as utterly un-American, as alien to our school of political thought, as the worst immigrants who land on our shores. This conduct is equally base and contemptible; they are the worst foes of our public-school system, because they strengthen the hands of its ultramontane enemies; they should receive the hearty condemnation of all Americans who are truly patriotic.

The mighty tide of immigration to our shores has brought in its train much of good and much of evil; and whether the good or the evil shall predominate depends mainly on whether these newcomers do or do not throw themselves heartily into our national life, cease to be European, and become Americans like the rest of us. More than a third of the people of the Northern States are of foreign birth or parentage. An immense number of them have become completely Americanized, and these stand on exactly the same plane as the descendants of any Puritan, Cavalier, or Knickerbocker among us, and do their full and honorable share of the nation's work. But where immigrants, or the sons of immigrants, do not heartily and in good faith throw in their lot with us, but cling to the speech, the customs, the ways of life, and the habits of thought of the Old World which they have left, they thereby harm both themselves and us. If they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remain alien elements, unassimilated, and with interests separate from ours, they are mere obstructions to the current of our national life, and, moreover, can get no good from it themselves. In fact, though we ourselves also suffer from their perversity, it is they who really suffer most. It is an immense benefit to the European immigrant to change him into an American citizen. To bear the name of American is to bear the most honorable of titles; and whoever does not so believe has no business to bear the name at all, and, if he comes from Europe, the sooner he goes back there the better. Besides, the man who does not become Americanized nevertheless fails to remain a European and becomes nothing at all. The immigrant cannot possibly remain what he was, or continue to be a member of the Old World society. If he tries to retain his old language, in a few generations it becomes a barbarous jargon; if he tries to retain his old customs and ways of life, in a few generations he becomes an uncouth boor. He has cut hmself off from the Old World, and cannot retain his connection with it; and if he wishes ever to amount to anything he must throw himself heart and soul, and without reservation, into the new life to which he has come.

So, from his own standpoint, it is beyond all question the wise thing for the immigrant to become thoroughly Americanized. Moreover, from our standpoint, we have a right to demand it. We freely extend the hand of welcome and of good-fellowship to every man, no matter what his creed or birthplace, who comes here honestly intent on becoming a good United States citizen like the rest of us; but we have a right, and it is our duty, to demand that he shall indeed become so, and shall not confuse the issues with which we are struggling by introducing among us Old-World quarrels and prejudices. There are certain ideas which he must give up. For instance, he must learn that American life is incompatible with the existence of any form of anarchy, or, indeed, of any secret society having murder for its aim, whether at home or abroad; and he must learn that we exact full religious toleration and the complete separation of Church and State. Moreover, he must not bring in his Old-World race and national antipathies, but must merge them into love for our common country, and must take pride in the things which we can all take pride in. He must revere only our flag; not only must it come first, but no other flag should even come second. He must learn to celebrate Washington's birthday rather than that of the Queen or Kaiser, and the Fourth of July instead of St. Patrick's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Day. Our political and social questions must be settled on their own merits, and not complicated by quarrels between England and Ireland, or France and Germany, with which we have nothing to do: it is an outrage to fight an American political campaign with reference to questions of European politics. Above all, the immigrant must learn to talk and think and *be* United States.

The immigrant of to-day can learn much from the experience of the immigrants of the past, who came to America prior to the Revolutionary War. Many of our most illustrious Revolutionary names were borne by men of Huguenot blood — Jay, Sevier, Marion, Laurens. But the Huguenots were, on the whole, the best immigrants we have ever received; sooner than any other, and more completely, they became American in speech, conviction, and thought. The Hollanders took longer than the Huguenots to become completely assimilated; nevertheless they in the end became so, immensely to their own advantage. One of the leading Revolutionary generals, Schuyler, and one of the Presidents of the United States, Van Buren, were of Dutch blood; but they rose to their positions, the highest in the land, because they had become Americans and had ceased being Hollanders. If they had remained members of an alien body, cut off by their speech and customs and belief from the rest of the American community, Schuyler would have lived his life as a boorish, provincial squire, and Van Buren would have ended his days a small tavern-keeper. So it is with the Germans of Pennsylvania. Those of them who became Americanized have furnished to our history a multitude of honorable names, from the days of the Mühlenbergs onward; but those who did not become Americanized form to the present day an unimportant body, of no significance in American existence. So it is with the Irish, who gave to Revolutionary annals such names as Carroll and Sullivan, and to the Civil War men like Sheridan and Shields,—all men who were Americans and nothing else: while the Irish who remain such, and busy themselves solely with alien politics, can have only an unhealthy influence upon American life, and can never rise as do their compatriots who become straight-out Americans. Thus it has ever been with all people who have come hither, of whatever stock or blood.

But I wish to be distinctly understood on one point. Americanism is a question of spirit, convictions, and purpose, not of creed or birthplace. The politician who bids for the Irish or German vote, or the Irishman or German who votes as an Irishman or German, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

despicable, for all citizens of this commonwealth should vote solely as Americans; but he is not a whit less despicable than the voter who votes against a good American, merely because that American happens to have been born in Ireland or Germany. Know-nothingism, in any form, is as utterly un-American as foreignism. It is a base outrage to oppose a man because of his religion or birthplace, and all good citizens will hold any such effort in abhorrence. A Scandinavian, a German, or an Irishman who has really become an American has the right to stand on exactly the same footing as any native-born citizen in the land, and is just as much entitled to the friendship and support, social and political, of his neighbors. Among the men with whom I have been thrown in close personal contact socially, and who have been among my staunchest friends and allies politically, are not a few Americans who happen to have been born on the other side of the water, in Germany, Ireland, Scandinavia; and I know no better men in the ranks of our native-born citizens.

In closing, I cannot better express the ideal attitude that should be taken by our fellow-citizens of foreign birth than by quoting the words of a representative American, born in Germany, the Honorable Richard Guenther, of Wisconsin. In a speech spoken at the time of the Samoan trouble, he said:

> We know as well as any other class of American citizens where our duties belong. We will work for our country in time of peace and fight for it in time of war, if a time of war should ever come. When I say our country, I mean, of course, our adopted country. I mean the United States of America. After passing through the crucible of naturalization, we are no longer Germans; we are Americans. Our attachment to America cannot be measured by the length of our residence here. We are Americans from the moment we touch the American shore until we are laid in American graves. We will fight for America whenever necessary. America, first, last, and all the time. America against Germany, America against the world; America, right or wrong; always America. We are Americans."

All honor to the man who spoke such words as those; and I believe they express the feelings of the great majority of those among our fellow-American citizens who were born abroad. We Americans can only do our allotted task well if we face it steadily and bravely, seeing but not fearing the dangers. Above all we must stand shoulder to shoulder, not asking as to the ancestry or creed of our comrades, but only demanding that they be in very truth Americans, and that we all work together, heart, hand, and head, for the honor and the greatness of our common country.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE LAW BEEN BENEFICIAL?

WITHOUT doubt the operation of the Interstate Commerce law has greatly disappointed many different classes of people. Its most ardent supporters now only claim for it a qualified success, while its utter failure is frequently asserted. Its obvious inefficiency has reacted upon its authors, who are blamed for every existing grievance, as well as upon the apostles of reform who pushed it as a panacea for all transportation evils, and who now solace themselves by accusing the railroads of conspiring to defeat its beneficent objects; while business men are often irritated by meeting continued difficulties which they think a proper statute should have removed, and abuse the Interstate Commerce law as a convenient scapegoat.

Many of these complaints arise from mistaken views as to the purpose and scope of the Act to regulate commerce. The grumbler who becomes profane against the law because he has to pay a dollar for a meal in a dining-car, has his counterpart in the Kansas farmer whose language is similarly lurid because of the fact that his wheat still goes to England by way of New York, Boston, or Philadelphia, instead of by way of the Gulf ports on lower rates, as promised him; and in the Missouri River jobber who is disappointed in his fond expectation that the law would force the allowance of rates for the local distribution of his goods, which would be no higher than the proportion of the through rates received beyond the river on like shipments from St. Louis and Chicago.

Again, many of the current complaints come from people who are entitled to a bad opinion of the law because they have themselves felt its pressure. The talk of this class has done much to excite popular prejudice against the statute—such, for example, as the commercial traveller who thinks that he has a vested right to specially low rates and specially large baggage allowances; the railway striker whose free pass is not renewed; the too enterprising manufacturer who has long enjoyed privileges of underbilling and false classification, and is staggered at the audacity which inspects his freight for weights and grades; the drover who has been used to cram thirty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cattle into a car at a carload rate, and finds it takes only twenty to load the same car when equality is enforced through a rate per hundred pounds; the heavy shipper who has so bountifully prospered under what he calls a wholesale rate that he cannot even yet believe that its discontinuance was not unjust; the minor city built up by the low rate for the long haul, but which now finds great commercial centres like New York and Chicago shipping goods to its very portals on the same rates that its jobbers enjoy. There are hundreds of cases like these which supply abundant declamation respecting the injury which the Interstate Commerce law is working to the business interests of the country, when the speakers in fact mean, though they usually do not say, that the injury is wrought upon their particular privilege.

But there are others who condemn the law because it stops short of practically accomplishing results which it was clearly designed to effect,—because in some respects it has failed in its work. This is true. The law has not reached its aim in many ways. To say this is to admit that it has not proved as beneficial to business interests as was properly expected; not that it has proved injurious to those interests, or that its fundamental principles are unsound. Its purpose and intent have been unexceptional in directions where its results have been failures.

In saying this we strike at its chief defects. The underlying principles of the Interstate Commerce law are only two: the first, that all charges for transportation shall be reasonable and just; the second, that common carriers subject to its provisions shall not commit unjust discriminations in their transportation service. The first has always been a rule of the common law, under which common carriers from time immemorial have been subject to an action for extortion in cases where unreasonable rates are charged; the second was applied in every early English railway charter under what were called Lord Shaftesbury's clauses, which were incorporated in a general Act of Parliament passed in 1845; and since then legislation in England and in America has always wisely insisted that railroads should not unjustly discriminate between their patrons. Of course this does not prevent the establishment of different units of computation, such as the rate per hundredweight, the rate per carload, and in some cases, perhaps, the rate per train-load; but in a service which all must perforce employ, and which in that sense is of a public nature, there is great justice in the requirement that the maximum unit shall be one which can be availed of by many, and not one which can be taken advantage of by one or two shippers only.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is believed that these two fundamental propositions of the law cannot be successfully controverted. Yet under our combined State and Federal system of government there was no way in which they could be judicially applied to commerce crossing State boundaries until the passage of the Interstate Commerce law.

It is long since an important complaint was heard that a railway freight rate was too high *per se*. There is now very little question of extortionate charges; for the trouble is the other way, and sagacious business men are beginning to inquire how long the roads can go on with their business at the present rates. The enforcement of the second requirement has been less generally successful. Nevertheless, is it not true that present conditions in the matter of unjust discrimination, on the whole, are better than before the passage of the law? To answer this question fairly requires a return in memory to the years preceding 1887. It can be safely asserted that many reforms have taken place, under the pressure of the statute, which, while longed for and urgently demanded, nevertheless would have been indefinitely postponed except for its enactment.

I will refer only to one or two examples. The manifold different classifications of freight formerly in use were provocative of infinite trouble and annoyance, as well as of unfair discriminations among shippers. East-bound classifications differed from west-bound, and north-bound and south-bound from both. Many roads also had a sheet for local uses whereby they increased their local charges while appearing to observe the standard mileage rates. Each State, by its State commissioners, had prescribed a varying arrangement. The whole system was in confusion and despair. The Senate Committee which reported on this subject in 1886 formulated this grievance in the following language:

> "That the differences in the classifications in use in various parts of the country, and sometimes for shipments over the same roads in different directions, are a fruitful source of misunderstandings, and are often made a means of extortion."

What was the result? Within sixty days after the passage of the Interstate Law, and as a measure absolutely necessary in order to arrange the tariffs for filing and posting as required, the six chief classifications of roads east of Chicago were merged into one; the general abandonment of local classifications for individual roads followed; and now, instead of forty differing general classifications, with numberless others of local application, there are practically only three,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called the Official, the Western, and the Southern, which are used in different sections of the country; while an effort for their final consolidation into one is in active progress.

Another grievance set forth in the same report was "that local rates are unreasonably high, compared with through rates." This was the so-called short-haul question. Upon the passage of the law a general reconstruction of tariffs followed, in which three-fourths of the cases where this complaint existed immediately disappeared; and those examples only have since remained which are believed to be fairly justifiable under the law, and substantially right in view of traffic conditions. This change was felt to be a great burden by the roads, but it was welcome to the public; and it has undoubtedly proved beneficial to the jobbing interests of our great commercial centres. Minor distributing-points, however, in some cases from this cause, have lost control of the market in what they were wont to call their "tributary" territory. In this matter the gain of one part of the business community is necessarily the loss of another part.

The effect upon railway earnings of the changes made in classification of freight and in conforming to the short-haul rule has not been generally appreciated. The reduction in rates through consolidation of classifications has been shown in a masterly way by the Auditor of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This, with the lowering of intermediate rates on short hauls, are causes largely responsible for the shrinkage in railway earnings since the passage of the law. What this means to the roads can be understood from the fact that a reduction of one mill per ton per mile amounts to a larger sum than the total amount of dividends paid on the stock of all the railroads in the United States.

Again, it was alleged "that unjustifiable discriminations are constantly made between individuals in the rates charged for like service under similar conditions." As to this the conditions have completely changed. Formerly every shipper had his own rate. The record of it was only to be found in the vest-pocket of the Assistant General Freight Agent. Now there is a substantial universality of tariff charges; the publicity of rates which the law requires has been beneficial; and, even when rates are "cut," all shippers who have freight to offer by any given road usually obtain the same reduction. The Inspection Bureaus also, established, in aid of the law, for the detection and correction of under-weighing and erroneous classification of freight, have proved efficient in the direction of holding all shippers upon an even keel.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another complaint set forth "that unreasonable discriminations are made between localities similarly situated." As to this also there has been improvement. In numberless contested rate adjustments, handled in railway associations, arguments have been made and decisions have turned upon the absolute justice of the claims of the localities whose relative rates were in dispute. The questions thus raised are often extremely difficult of solution. All rates to every common market have to be adjusted to correspond with like rates from every point of shipment and by all possible gateways. The effect of bringing these questions into the arena of politics and sectional strife by a possible governmental ownership of the roads, or by an assumption of governmental control of rate-making either by Congress directly or by a commission, may be readily imagined. The statement cannot be denied that, since the passage of the Interstate law, the constant effort of traffic managers has been to secure justice to the shippers by their respective lines, and to obtain for each locality the relative position to which it is fairly entitled.

Other specifications were enumerated by the Senate Committee; such as the apparent use of railway rates to foster monopoly, to enrich favored shippers, and to prevent free competition in certain lines of trade. The general complaint was made that "favoritism and secrecy introduce an element of uncertainty into business transactions that greatly retards the development of industries and commerce." While these complaints are not wholly at rest, a fair-minded man cannot fail to admit that things in this respect are better than they were.

The great difficulty to-day is not so much in the matter of secret "deals" and favored shippers as in respect to outbreaks of rate-wars, which are disturbing and distressing to business interests, even though all shippers are served alike. These rate-wars occurred before the passage of the law, probably as frequently as now, and with worse results to individual shippers. There is now always some advertisement of the reduction; and a traffic officer is usually quick to give to every shipper the full advantage of the rate authorized upon his line. The charge made in 1886 by the Senate Committee was this:

> "That the secret cutting of rates and the sudden fluctuations that take place are demoralizing to all business except that of a purely speculative character, and frequently occasion great injustice and heavy losses."

Eliminate the word "secret," and the charge is true to-day. In this respect the law has proved of little benefit. Nor has "secret" rate-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cutting altogether disappeared. The reason for the continuance of rate-wars is easily apparent. The law was so drafted as to require the utmost stringency of competition. It was planned by theorists, who no doubt honestly believed that "competition is the life of trade" in transportation as in everything else, and the more the merrier. If one of them had owned a coal-yard in Omaha, stocked at a $6 rate in September, and should see the rate reduced to $4 in October by "free and unrestricted competition," he would think that it was not the life of *his* trade at least. The fact is that transportation is not a satisfactory field in which to apply that doctrine. It not only ruins the transportation agencies, but it is very likely to ruin everybody else. If, perchance, it enables a buyer to fill up in a sudden rush, it thereby fosters all manner of speculations, and substitutes for the salutary forms of legitimate trade the business methods of the "plunger." In railroad rates unregulated competition is the prolific parent of unjust discrimination. The same law both canonized the mother and bastardized the child. It forbade agreements to temper competitive excesses, while it provided fines and imprisonments for every variation from the published rates.

In this matter railways are differentiated from other industries. A merchant is not expected to refrain from unjust discrimination between his customers, except so far as self-interest restrains him; nor is he confined by law to a just and reasonable price for his goods. And while co-operation between business competitors is now admitted to be entirely proper and legitimate for the necessary regulation of excessive competition, in railroad traffic there is no other way to get on. Traffic must of course be divided in some way; the present method is as unscientific as that of a group of chickens picking up corn, or a lot of hogs with their feet in a trough. If voluntary co-operation for the just and reasonable distribution of traffic is forbidden, then combinations in other forms are forced upon the railway system. Excessive competition finally results in monopoly. A monopoly of ownership will unquestionably terminate unjust discrimination; and this is by no means an improbable or altogether undesirable solution of the difficulty; for steadiness in railway rates must in some way be attained.

Another trouble with the present law lies in the fact that its title is misleading. It is not in fact an "Act to regulate commerce." It purports only to deal with a single element of commerce, namely, transportation, and with that only as conducted by rail, or by joint

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rail and water routes. The vast business conducted within the separate States is specially excluded, and all water or other forms of carriage are exempt. Until the whole ground is fairly covered, injustice will result to the carriers which the law attempts to reach; and when injustice exists rebellion is not far distant.

Again, the law undertakes to harness down the railroads without in any way seeking to conserve their rights. They are hampered in their operations and hemmed in by penalties. The spirit in which the law was framed was evidently a spirit of regulation and control, from which the idea of protection was wholly absent.

And finally, the method in which the Interstate Commerce Commission was injected into the system of regulation was, to say the least, of very doubtful wisdom. It was apparently a measure of expediency rather than of wise consideration; as though Congress had said, "Here are some general principles on which the world substantially agrees; let us make them applicable to traffic between the States, and then appoint a Commission to work out the rest of the problem. In that way we can wash our hands of the matter." Years have passed, and with them has gradually disappeared the practical usefulness of the Commission. To recognize this implies no criticism upon its members. They have one and all labored earnestly and seriously to make the law respected and to give value to its principles. The simple fact is this, that the scheme as arranged could not possibly be made to work. The Commission was not a court, although it tried to assume a judicial attitude; it was not an executive, although it endeavored to make rules and to enforce regulations. Its judgments were presently found to be not enforceable without a litigation *de novo* in the courts; the courts also declined to enforce its subpœnas for obtaining evidence; and after a time its administrative rules were accepted or rejected according to the disposition of those upon whom they were designed to act. For a time it cut quite an important figure in the public eye. The roads were at first inclined to accept its views of policy; its ideas have been quite generally sound and judicious; when reluctance to conform to them was observed, the oversight was quietly ignored. But finally the defects in its constitution became apparent, and the disregarding of its recommendations became not the exception but the rule. It is now practically waiting for the outcome of certain pending litigation in order to know how far it can legally act on the lines laid down in its charter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For this unfortunate situation Congress alone is to blame. Two courses were open: either to establish an administrative body, to collect information in the way of statistics and tariffs, and to enforce conformity to what may be called the publicity features of the law, leaving injured citizens to their actions for damages; or to establish a body with judicial authority, a Court of Interstate Commerce, having power of process and of judgment, to which either shippers or carriers might go for valuable relief. Congress did neither of these things. It invented a body apparently both quasi-judicial and quasi-administrative, but in fact neither judicial nor administrative. Worse than this, as a judicial body it was necessary that it be clearly free from bias, and wholly aloof from all personal contact with matters presented for decision; yet it was compelled by the law itself to see that all misdemeanors were promptly prosecuted and punished. And, on the other hand, as a part of the federal executive it had no more authority than Dogberry's watchman:

"'You are to bid any man stand, in the prince's name.'
'How if a' will not stand?'
'Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go; and presently call the rest of the watch together, and thank God you are rid of a knave.'"

This whole lamentable fiasco is due to the draftsmen of the law. It never seems to have occurred to any one in Congress that there was any impropriety in making the same men both prosecutors and judges in the same matters, or that any railroad company would object to accept the opinion of a public prosecutor as a final judgment. In its Third Annual Report the Commission itself called attention to this matter in the following words:

"There is also in the public mind a sense of incongruity between the prosecuting function, involving as it does detective methods and an attitude of hostility, and the judicial function, rightly expected to require impartial and just investigation and decision of controverted questions of law and fact. It is a fundamental principle, and generally provided by statutes, that every man shall have a fair trial before a tribunal free from any possible bias that might arise from relationship, interest in the result, or partisan connection as attorney and counsel, or who may become a prosecutor in the transaction."

The rare tact and discretion with which the members of the Commission have carried themselves in their difficult task have avoided friction and for a long time prevented a full vision of the extremely difficult situation in which they were placed. The time has now come when something must be done. A radical overhauling of the law is necessary. It should be torn in pieces and reconstructed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some regulation of interstate commerce by a national law is necessary. Experience dictates that such regulation should not be too minute in its details; that it should not undertake to do too much; that it should firmly assert certain fundamental principles, and at the same time should fairly recognize the rights of the railway corporations which represent the capital and the brains that have made our present industrial conditions possible.

The leading features of the Interstate Commerce Law, as above enumerated, cannot be claimed to be unconstitutional. Much good has resulted from the attempt to put into practical effect certain principles that all sound railroad men, theoretically at least, approve, and would willingly, each for himself, conform to. More than this, there is need of some system of governmental authority, not only to control the roads, but to protect them,—to protect them not so much against the public as against themselves and against each other. The railroads of the United States in many respects are helpless creatures. Their natural tendency appears to be to run down the hill into the sea. Their competitors on every side are wont to pick and plunder and pollute them. Their only weapon of retaliation or defence is the reduction of their earnings, in the hope that it may injure the others more. They are frequently passing from view as business entities; and let us hope that the United States courts will be able to manage them with universal satisfaction. Unless the lines that remain are taken in hand by some *vis major*, and new conditions soon applied, they will presently see their net earnings vanish; and the United States Government will be managing the consolidated system of American railways, without any expensive purchase, and without knowing how it came about; the practical General Managers being the Circuit and District Judges, operating through experts or lawyers called Receivers, and meeting in different judicial districts for frequent conference upon matters of general policy concerning rates, wages, and expenditures. This happy result has already been quite substantially attained in the eighth judicial circuit, which embraces Little Rock, St. Louis, Omaha, St. Paul, and Denver.

After all these unsatisfactory years it would not seem to be a difficult thing to draft a much better law than the one which was adopted in 1887. The foundation principles of the Interstate Commerce law are sound the world over. Their simple declaration has been of general utility. Congress should couple with this the prompt enforcement of civil remedies. A few well-considered money judgments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for damages would settle questions rapidly and in the orderly way of the common law. Penalties and forfeitures are obnoxious and practically futile. The penalties in this statute against charging less than the tariff rate are not enforceable against the railway corporations, but only against railway employees and shippers; the sympathy of juries and of the public is naturally with the giving of the lower rate; the courts have declared that no person who is himself subject to prosecution can be compelled to make disclosure of incriminating facts; and the ordinary difficulties attending criminal proceedings are thus intensified to a degree practically prohibitive of success. It would seem wise at once to abandon the unsuccessful experiment of preventing unjust discrimination by personal penalties, and try the alternative expedient, successfully employed in other countries, of authorizing the corporations to divide their traffic equitably. A bureau of railroad statistics and tariffs should be maintained in one of the Departments, and all proper publicity assured. The basic requirements of reasonable and equal rates should be enforced through the right of citizens to sue for the breach thereof, either in the present federal courts or in a tribunal specially organized for the trial and decision of such matters. The carriers also should be accorded equivalent rights and just protection; State regulation would gradually assimilate itself to national regulation in statutes and decisions; and, though the immediate aspect of the law would appear weak and even useless to many who clamor for absolute provisions and despotic restraints, five years' experience would demonstrate its vastly superior efficiency over the present scheme.

The Interstate Commerce law in many ways has been beneficial to business interests, but in its present form there is little value now remaining beyond the assertion of important general principles; while in some respects it is more prejudicial than beneficial. It demands both steadiness of rates and active competition, things which, as Judge Cooley once said, necessarily kill each other. It is like requiring boys to play foot-ball under a rule forbidding the players to touch one another. The prospect of anything more than superficial action under our present legislative system is unfortunately quite remote. Senators and Congressmen appear to regard the subject of our domestic commerce as a kind of butterfly-net wherewith to entrap the fluttering voter as he wings his way from party to party. Let us hope that public opinion will soon awake to the necessity of action for the preservation of the American Railway System.

ALDACE F. WALKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS NEW YORK MORE CIVILIZED THAN KANSAS?

"We do not want any more States until we can civilize Kansas."—*The New York Evening Post.*

THIS article is not to be the result of wounded State pride, nor is it a quarrel with the "Evening Post," nor an attack on New York. Kansas cares too little, perhaps, what is said of her. The "Evening Post" and New York do not care at all what is said of them—certainly not if it be said anywhere west of London. Moreover, Kansas is humble just now. On a counting of noses she might, perhaps, agree with the "Evening Post," and vote herself not civilized. Republicans would say: "We are out; the State has lapsed into barbarism." Populists would say: "We have been in power scarcely a year—not long enough to civilize a great commonwealth." Democrats would say: "We have always been out; the State has always been savage."

No section of the country can get true ideas of another section by the perusal of newspapers. It is the strange and monstrous and unusual thing that gets reported by telegraph, and it loses nothing of its strangeness and monstrosity in the transmittal. A telegram came from New York to the Kansas newspapers not long ago, saying that it required 480,000 meals per day to keep the destitute of the city from starvation. The report stated that the charitable organizations had that day furnished 6,000 of these necessary meals. This left in the Kansas mind, dependent upon newspapers for facts, a deficit of 474,000 meals, and a painful doubt as to whether the destitute who are to receive their yesterday meal some two months hence will survive to enjoy it. A later telegram announced that scarcely one house in five on Fifth Avenue and other up-town streets is occupied this winter; that the millionaires have all fled to avoid the demands of thousands of starving men and women, and that they have left their houses barricaded in the most formidable manner. If Mr. Gould and Mr. Most monopolize the column of New York news, the Western farmer dependent on that column for information is gradually led to think of New Yorkers as either "capitalists" or anarchists. If no Kansas woman appears in the New York papers except Mrs. Lease, the tendency of New York is to generalize from her, and some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundreds of thousands of sane, sensible, sweet-tempered women count for nothing. People who never hear of anybody from Kansas except Jerry Simpson naturally have queer ideas of the State. The freak, in such case, fixes the type. The "Evening Post's" ideas of Kansas may have been created by press reports, and probably were.

But is New York more civilized than Kansas? A comparison will be drawn,—broadly and roughly, of course,—not with the idea of producing conviction, but rather of provoking reflection. It will be drawn occasionally between the two States; but first, and perhaps chiefly, between the million and a half people who inhabit Kansas, and the million and a half who inhabit Manhattan Island. There is nothing unfair in this. The question is one of fact—which people are the more civilized. There may be excuses for the barbarism of New York city, just as there may be for the barbarism of Kansas. But the causes of excuses do not alter the facts.

There are certain things, perhaps, that all would agree upon as indications of civilization. "We are accustomed," says Mill, "to call a country more civilized if we think it more improved; more eminent in the best characteristics of man and society; further advanced in the road to perfection; happier, nobler, wiser." Mill further says that the more a community becomes civilized, the more power will be found lodged, not in individuals or in knots of individuals, but in the masses. This power is made up of property and acquirements of mind. Both these, he says, in the beginnings of society, are confined to the few. General diffusion of property and intelligence indicates civilization. In savage life the community extends no protection to the individual; every one must trust his own strength and cunning. Law and a general obedience to law indicate civilization. According to Mill, then, general intelligence and culture, general morality, general health in the social relations, general good-fellowship and happiness, and generally distributed wealth and power, are indications of civilization. Adopting these ideas as a basis, let us proceed to compare the people of New York and of Kansas.

And first a word as to their origin and history. Only now and then do you meet a man or a woman in Kansas who was born in the State. Nearly the entire adult population came from other States. By far the larger part came from New England, either directly or by a second migration from the Middle States. They are New Englanders or the descendants of New Englanders. A great many came from New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Every Northern State is repre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sented. All these parent States are considered civilized. No Northern State, I believe, has now so large a percentage of native Americans as Kansas, for Kansas has about 90 per cent American-born citizens and about 70 per cent American-born of American parents; New York city has less than 58 per cent native-born, and less than 20 per cent native-born of native parents. Kansas is pre-eminently a native-American State; a New England, Puritan community; a race of pretty nearly pure Anglo-Saxon descent, the largest infusion of foreign blood being German. One is tempted to say that Manhattan Island is rather a foreign community, a great aggregation of strangers, largely Irish, largely German, considerably Russian, and extensively miscellaneous.

Kansas is scarcely a third of a century old. In 1860 there were only 100,000 people in the Territory; in 1870, between 300,000 and 400,000; in 1880, 1,000,000; in 1890, nearly 1, 500,000. As a community it is young. It was settled by young men. Gray heads were rare fifteen years ago, though more common now. I cannot but believe that these young men, these colonists, were of the more intelligent, enterprising, and courageous half of their generation. Such has been the usual character of colonists from the days of the Greek colonies down. Modern colonization has, of course, differed greatly from the colonization of former times. Modern American colonists have assaulted the raw prairies and the difficult mountains, armed with all the equipments of this great inventive age. They have never for a moment been isolated. They have taken with them, as they went, the railroad, the telegraph, the post-office, and the printing-press.

The circumstances of the settlement of Kansas were peculiar. Men have been drawn to New York by accumulated wealth and power, and by supposed extraordinary opportunities for pleasure and profit. The first attraction to Kansas was a war waging for an abstract principle, the abolition of human slavery. It is fair to say that that war fixed in considerable measure the character of subsequent immigration. Thousands of the spirited, adventurous boys who in 1861 rushed into the Northern armies, naturally turned, when the contest was over in 1865, toward the first great battle-ground of the triumphant cause, toward the new, young, already historic State of Kansas. No other State has a larger percentage of army veterans. Men came to Kansas young and poor. They found there no accumulated wealth, no established laws and customs, no old families, no long-continued abuses, no political or social distinctions, no high, no low; nothing but atmosphere, sunlight, soil, and room.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In one sense New York city is old. It has been the metropolis of a great country for more than a century. In another sense it is new. Like Kansas, though not to the same extent, it is made up of colonists. So far as these colonists are American-born, they are drawn from the same general sources as the immigrants to Kansas; but four-fifths of the inhabitants of New York are of foreign birth or foreign parentage. They are the product of very different social, political, and economical conditions. They were driven to emigration by hunger and Old-World oppression. The Kansas colonists were spurred rather by innate activity, enterprise, and ambition. Kansas is the product of the institutions, influences, and conditions of the Northern and Eastern States of the Union—the product of Northern and Eastern civilization, whatever that may be. New York is rather, though not to the same great extent, the product of European institutions, influences, and conditions. Whether emigrants from Northern and Eastern States of the Union are likely to be superior to emigrants from Ireland, Germany, and other parts of Europe, is the question. Native-born Americans will say, everything considered, Yes. They will say that two or more generations of training under the free institutions of America is likely to have turned out a somewhat improved species of human being; that the late product of Northern and Eastern conditions can hardly be very bad; that there is a sort of presumption that the native Americans who in the past third of a century have populated the western slope of the Mississippi are better wrought, better tempered, better fashioned human instruments than the foreigners of New York city taken as a whole. If such a presumption may be indulged, it is, of course, not conclusive. So much for the *a priori* argument from origin and history.

Let us next examine the actual tangible evidence of civilization in the two communities; and first, as to intellectual conditions.

The illiteracy statistics for 1890 are not at hand. In 1880 the percentage of illiteracy in Kansas was about the same as in the State of New York, five and a fraction. The percentage in New York city must have been considerably greater, because the percentage among the foreign-born in the State was six times greater than among the native-born, and the city is nearly one-half foreign. In Kansas, in 1890, four-fifths of all the children under eighteen and over five years of age were enrolled in the schools; in the State of New York scarcely more than two-thirds; in New York city less than one-half. Kansas spent on her schools $5,000,000; the State of New York,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with more than four times the population, only $17,500,000. Kansas to-day has a permanent public-school fund of $6,000,000. Only one other State, I believe, has a greater.

New York city, rich beyond the dreams of avarice,—at least, measured by the accumulations of a few of its citizens,—does not furnish its children adequate school accommodations. Actually, in this age of the world, in wise and wealthy New York, there are thousands of children in some districts who cannot get into the public schools for the lack of house-room and teaching-force. The president of the Board of Education, in a public address delivered in 1888, computed the number at 12,000. I have been told that the difficulties have increased since then. In a poor or sparsely populated community this would not be so bad, would not be presumptive evidence of a lack of civilization. Yet even in the arid regions of western Kansas every child has opportunity to attend school. A community need not be so very highly civilized to know that under a free government nothing else is so necessary as the education of the children. Yet New York city does not adequately provide for it.

The State of New York, with a population four times as large as Kansas, has thirty colleges for men and women, with about 12,000 students, and a large percentage of these students come from other States. Kansas has eighteen colleges, with 4,200 students enrolled, practically all from within her own borders. The University of Kansas, beginning in 1866 with scarcely a collegiate student and with a very small income, now has a total income of about $80,000, and an enrolment, outside its bread-and-butter schools, of 328. Yet, it has only the 1,500,000 people within its own borders to draw from, and it is 400 miles removed from the most remote parts of the State. Columbia College is considerably more than a century old. It has an income of $650,000. It has a brilliant faculty. There are 5,000,000 people within 100 miles of it. No other institution in the country can count half that number. Yet, with all these advantages of age, wealth, and location, Columbia had enrolled in its department of liberal arts last year only about 300. The strength of its professional schools is admitted; but, aside from these, it is outranked by a dozen or more American universities and colleges. It has not been a producer of scholars. It has little influence in the country; and it had hardly any until a very recent period in the educational world. America owes more to Williams, Amherst, and Bowdoin than to Columbia. One reason for this would seem to be that Manhattan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Island is not a patron of liberal education; that it is almost wholly engrossed in money-making and -spending; that the intellectual life of America is not there.

There is plenty of shrewdness and sharpness in New York, but is there any real intellectual life outside a coterie of scholars, scientific students, and authors? A great many books are published in New York, but are they read there? There are great libraries in New York, but are there people in them? I am told that there is no way of determining the exact circulation of the best magazines in New York city. The news-stands seem given up mainly to the illustrated publications, not a few of which are of bad character.

New Yorkers are certainly great readers of newspapers. Kansans also are. It may not be uninstructive to compare the newspapers supported by the two communities, not only to show what the communities read, but what is going on among them. I have taken at random a copy of the most popular, but not the most sensational evening paper in New York. This contains less than fourteen full columns of local news, excluding two columns of market reports. Two and a half columns are devoted to theatres and sports; one to the relief of the poor; two to a bank failure; three-quarters of a column to annual appropriations for the police department, and seven columns to New York city crime and scandal. There are three divorce cases, a seduction, a criminal assault, a bribery case, two defaults, two highway robberies, a blackmailing scandal, a case of mayhem, two burglaries, two cases of larceny, several cases of assault and battery, several disorderly houses raided, a case of bigamy, an arrest for fraud, the suicide of a fifteen-year-old boy, the story of a wife driven to suicide by a dissipated husband, frauds in the custom-house, a confidence game, "Jack the Kisser" apprehended, a poisoner on trial, etc. All this is written up in the most artistic, dramatic, and occasionally humorous manner, and makes seven solid columns of local crime and scandal. Four columns of fiction, four of telegrams containing a good many reports of crime, and three of editorial and literary matter, make the total twenty-eight columns. In the last copy of a New York morning paper that happened to come under my eye I found all of pages 1, 2, and 3, and more, devoted to a prize-fight. This made more than a third of all the reading-matter in the paper. Then there were many columns devoted to "Boss" Croker, two or three columns to "Boss" Platt, three columns to "Boss" McKane. It appeared also that the Chamber of Commerce, after one hundred

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and twenty-four years of non-interference, had at last been driven to take some action for municipal reform.

I take at random a copy of the only evening paper having a general circulation in Kansas. I find in it four columns of editorial; twelve of general news, political, etc.; three of crime and scandal (of which one-third of a column was from Kansas, two-thirds of a column from Kansas City, and two columns reported by the Associated Press); three columns of financial news; one of railroad news; one and a quarter columns of art and literary news and criticism; two of what may be called philosophy and sociology; one and three-quarters columns of theatrical and sporting matter, and four of reprint of a literary character, including three excellent poems: total, thirty-two columns.

Kansas has 759 newspapers. The State of New York, with a population four times as great, has not three times the number. Practically speaking, New York reads only New York publications. The three Kansas City daily papers are largely supported by Kansas, and the best St. Louis, Chicago, New York, and Boston papers have many subscribers in the State. The people of Kansas really read and discuss the speeches made in Congress. I have been told that book and magazine publishers regard Kansas as one of their best markets.

There are in Kansas a hundred towns and cities having from 1,000 to 40,000 inhabitants. It would be hard to find one of these without a well-patronized public reading-room and library. Almost all these villages and cities have active literary clubs. Local newspapers abound in notices of the Chautauquan Circle, the History Club, the Browning Society, the Shakespeare Club, the University Extension Class, the Social Science Club, the Art League, etc. There has flourished for years a large and enthusiastic State organization of women for the study of social science. It may be well doubted whether a body of a million and a half people can be found anywhere in the world who do any more independent thinking, reading, and debating than the people of Kansas. Their reading may not always be the best, their reasoning may often be very shallow, their debating inane; nevertheless they are as a people intellectually alive. They actually think about public affairs; they ponder matters beyond mere private and selfish interests; they discuss questions of the public good; they have an intellectual life; they are alert, active, open to ideas,—not dull and apathetic.

Kansas is traversed east and west by half a dozen great transcontinental lines of railroad. This means that practically every county

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the State is situated on one or more of the great highways of commerce. The State has no backwoods, no dark, inaccessible corners, no remote nooks where the last century lingers. The State had in 1890 nearly 9,000 miles of railway; New York had 1,150 miles less.

In spite of the commercial character of the people of New York city, in spite of the small army of commercial travellers whose address is New York, it is still true that the great body of the people know next to nothing of the rest of the country. The West knows the East; the East does not know the West. This is true because the West came from the East in the first place, and because thousands of Westerners visit the East while only hundreds or tens of Easterners visit the West. The struggle for existence in New York city is so severe that the body of the people have not the time, if they had the inclination, to acquire general information. Life with them is intense and swift, but it runs in a very narrow channel after all. In a very real sense the people are provincial. They ask the visitor from Kansas City if he knows their friends in St. Paul. They ask the visitor from Denver whether he enjoys any religious privileges in that city of churches. Many of them not only know nothing of all America beyond a few streets of the metropolis, but they actually take pride in not wanting to know anything.

Let us turn from the consideration of intellectual to the consideration of moral conditions. No statistics as to the vice and crime of New York city are at hand, no figures as to the drunkenness, gambling, and prostitution, nor to the defalcations, murders, and suicides. But if the statistics were recited, the vice and crime of New York city would be beyond description. Dr. Parkhurst, Anthony Comstock, Henry Bergh and others have given hints of it from time to time. The city spends between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 annually upon its police department. This equals the entire cost of township, county, municipal, and State government in Kansas. The State of New York has 3,675 inmates of its juvenile reformatories,—Kansas only 208; New York has 8,190 convicts in its penitentiaries,—Kansas only 918. New York has twenty times as many paupers in its poorhouses as Kansas. The city unquestionably furnishes more than its quota of these criminals and paupers.

One index of the morality and civilization of a community is the condition and environment of its children. What sort of nurse is New York city? How much wise and tender care does it give its little ones? I have been told that, generally speaking, it is only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outsiders that go into the poor quarters of the metropolis. Respectable residents know nothing of the miles of streets full of foul sights, sounds, and smells; of the swarms of dirty, ragged children constantly suffering for lack of light, air, and room, not to say food, shelter, and clothing. Nearly all the city children suffer for lack of light, pure air, and room; and all in a greater or less degree suffer constantly from corrupting, degrading, brutalizing, and at best hardening sights, sounds, and associations. One day a drunken ruffian on Broadway threw his arm around the waist of a charming and beautifully dressed little girl of twelve and attempted to kiss her. She tore herself away and disappeared in the crowd. Nothing came of it. If the fellow had been knocked down or locked up it would not have made the incident any more civilizing. The drunken man, the brazen prostitute, the street broil, the overdriven horse, the flaring theatrical poster, the cringing beggar, the fleeting pickpocket, and the indifferent policeman are not good civilizing sights for children to look upon. These are hardening, brutalizing, and corrupting. It is true that New York has its great charitable institutions. In eighteen years the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children has rescued from abuse—"and even," says a late writer, "in instances, from mutilation"—more than 25,000 children. Twelve thousand come yearly under the influence of the Children's Aid Society. In thirty-two years 92,000 have been sent to country homes. But still the crime against children remains. It is chronic. Child-labor—and there is much of it in New York—is bad enough, but child-vagrancy is infinitely worse. The "Memorial History" of the city, lately published, says that the number of homeless and vagrant youths in the city during each year is 30,000. New York has its prevention and aid societies; Kansas does not need them.

Room, air, light, are the great disinfectants and deodorizers. Were there twofold the vice in Kansas that there is in New York, it would not be half so deadly. But there is not the tenth part as much. Topeka is a city of 40,000 inhabitants. It contains a large population of laboring men, the men among whom drunkenness is supposed to be most common. Yet there are children in Topeka more than a dozen years old who never saw a saloon or a drunken man.

Rome did not become more civilized as the family decayed; as ties of relationship became less binding; as marriage lost its sacredness and became first a mere tolerable contract and then an irksome matter of business; as children decreased and bachelors increased. That is not necessarily the most civilized community where vice,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

luxury, extravagance, insanity, suicide, and sudden death most abound. If it were so, my case would be closed. New York certainly leads Kansas in all these things. In New York near relatives live side by side for years without knowing it; there bachelorhood is almost the normal state, and childless, money marriages are quite the thing. The club and the theatre usurp the place of home. Luxury runs riot, and insanity and suicide are common. The statistics show the pace at which life runs. In 1890 there were 43,000 deaths in New York city; in Kansas there were only 12,000. Of course it will be said that certain things have always been the incidents of great cities. That is true; and one of these things is barbarism.

The environment of people in a great city is against them. If they become savage, there is some excuse for it. They are all strangers. They are without the restraint of public opinion. It takes time and extraordinary ability to establish any reputation good or bad. Meanwhile chance reigns, and chance is the great demoralizer. The less power and wealth and reputation come by chance the better for the community. In small towns and country districts capacity and integrity are more quickly discerned and more surely rewarded. Quackery and knavery live and flourish in great cities.

If the religious character and habits of the people are to count in determining the degree of their civilization, then it is to be observed that Kansas has 41 Young Men's Christian Associations; New York State, with four times the population, has only 148; Kansas has more than 1,000 Societies of Christian Endeavor; New York State only about 3,000; Kansas has about 600 Epworth Leagues, New York State only about 1,200. Kansas has 4,927 church organizations; New York State 8,237. In Kansas there are 269,000 communicants in Protestant churches; in New York 1,018,000. New York has 1,153,000 communicants in Catholic churches, and including these it has a larger percentage of church communicants than Kansas. More than half of the church members in New York State are Catholics; in Kansas less than a fifth. The church communicants in Kansas are 23 per cent of the whole population; in New York, including Catholics, 36 per cent; in New Mexico, practically all Catholics, 68 per cent. Excluding Catholics, Kansas has a larger percentage of church communicants than New York. It is perhaps fair to exclude the Catholic church for the reason that children are born into that church, they become communicants before they have really reached years of discretion, and once a churchman always a churchman.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In one sense wealth is an indication of civilization. The real value of the assessed property in New York State is about $1,000 per capita; in Kansas about $750. But New York's public indebtedness is greater than that of Kansas. The annual interest paid by New Yorkers on municipal, county, state, and national indebtedness is $2.13 per capita; that paid by Kansans is $1.67. The mortgage indebtedness of New York is $268 per capita; of Kansas $170. The proportion of the total debt to the total value of mortgaged property is greater in New York. But whatever may be the case with the State at large, New York city is certainly much richer than the State of Kansas. No doubt it would take the entire possessions of the fifty richest men in Kansas—with one or two exceptions, perhaps—to buy a single one of the Vanderbilt residences. There are few men in Kansas whose entire fortune would defray the annual expense of some families in New York. So far as aggregate wealth or per capita wealth goes, New York has the better of the argument. But "per capita" is not the whole of the story. It is of very small advantage to the poor to live surrounded by great wealth. The poor of New York can, it is true, go along Fifth Avenue during the long winter evenings and stare at the palaces. Here and there something of the interior glow and splendor filters out through the draperies. Such crumbs as this ought, perhaps, to console the 80,000 unemployed, but they do not. John Stuart Mill and Thorold Rogers agree that that is the best governed and best civilized country where property is generally distributed and where the great body of the people live in material comfort. This is the case with Kansas. The wealth is as yet in the hands of the many. It has all been produced within a third of a century by the people who now hold it. It was not inherited, nor brought in by rich immigrants. Somebody starves to death every week in New York,—at least I have been told so. Nobody has ever starved to death in Kansas so far as can be ascertained. The great body of the people dwell in comparative comfort. They live an easier life and are better-to-do than the great body of the people in New York city or state. Their wealth is a monument to the productive power of equality and liberty. The material results achieved in Kansas within a third of a century could be achieved only by a highly civilized people.

Some unlucky New York investors will receive these remarks with a grim smile. They will say, "Kansas people do not pay us what they owe." Kansas has had many misfortunes, and one of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a superabundance of money a few years ago. If New York real-estate mortgages should some time become very popular throughout England; if this popularity should develop into a craze; if the market rate of interest on such mortgages should, under the influence of this mania, drop from five to four, and then to three and two per cent; if the demand in England became so great that immense corporations were formed there for the negotiation of such mortgages, and gold came over from England in tons; if agents were sent about the streets to drum up borrowers; if English investors did not use the tenth part of the caution in making New York investments that they used in London transactions,—then a good many unscrupulous Londoners would get into the business; honest real-estate owners, attracted by low rates, would lose their heads and borrow without needing to borrow; dishonest owners would sell their houses with mortgages, and then speculate on the supposed equities; land would acquire a "value" not based upon its earning-power; the abundance of money would inflate all kinds of business, and New York would have a "boom." During this "boom" England would be full of New York "schemes." The financier on one side of Lombard Street, who wanted to get into the pocket of the financier on the other side of the street, would find New York an available field of operations. The London broker, finding the investors of Scotland well inclined toward anything labelled New York, would take measures to create this or that kind of New York security—and he might be very careless what it was. Then, if some sort of calamity should come, and hard times ensue, a great deal of property—valuable, steadily productive, but not worth the mortgage—would pass under foreclosure. A great many agents would return to England. A great many London brokers and financiers, their pockets well lined with commissions, would hold up their hands in holy horror at this dishonesty of "the West," and New York would have a bad name in England for some time. Yet all this time New York would be a great city, the State would be a great and rich State, and the people would be, some good, some bad, some wise, some foolish, just as in England. The result would be unfortunate, but England would be quite as much to blame as New York.

Substitute the East for England, and the West for New York, and the above is, in extreme form, a history of what has happened in this country. The East has lost some—perhaps much—money in Western investments, but it talks a great deal more about the hundreds so lost than it does about the thousands lost in Wall Street

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and other home speculations. And it is unfair for the East to blame the West for its own folly. The loan companies that have done the most mischief have been owned in the East. The unnecessary railroads have been built by the East. If those railroads have been foolishly or dishonestly managed, it has been by Eastern boards of directors.

The social conditions of Kansas are upon the whole much safer, more wholesome and civilized, than those of New York city. New York, with its very rich and very poor, is afflicted with a swarm of snobs, adventurers, and parasites on the one hand, and paupers, criminals, and anarchists on the other. The rich grow hard, and the poor sodden. Great differences of wealth and station, the cruel, artificial, and strangling distinctions of caste, beget, after a time, real differences of character. The rich and the poor act and react on each other to the detriment of both. There are no artificial distinctions among the people of Kansas. Each has opportunity according to his capacity, and each is received for what he is. Perfect social equality, or something near it, is still the condition. Men like equality as they like physical comfort. There are in Kansas opportunity and certainty of reward for the worthy, capable man, whether he have capital and backing to rely upon or only his own faculties. There is opportunity in New York, too, but the battle is a cruel one and the issue very uncertain.

New York is a city without homes. Among old residents and new, native and foreign, among the poor, the well-to-do, and the rich, the question is almost universal: "Where do you live now?" How many in the whole great city have lived ten years in one house? How many have lived five years where they live now? New Yorkers are as nomadic as the Bedouins; but the Bedouins have a much freer range, and this is an advantage. To be confined to one little island and yet to have no home is to acquire the vices and to suffer the limitations both of the tramp and the serf. There may be disadvantages about neighbors and friends, but after all it is civilizing to have them. New Yorkers have no neighbors and few real friends. The housing of New York is not good. The people are packed away like sardines in a box, or dishes in a cupboard: some cupboards have four and some sixteen shelves; only a very few families enjoy an entire cupboard to themselves. The people suffer from too great proximity; they are often—and perhaps commonly—too close for moral or physical decency. Light is a rare and precious commodity. Sewer-gas first-hand is not good to breathe, but breathed several times in succession by different persons it becomes noxious.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Society in Kansas no doubt lacks ritual and regalia. Mr. Astor, formerly of New York, has moved to London, bought a newspaper, and baited his hook for a peerage or its equivalent. He has abandoned his native country. There is no complaint about this. But Mr. Astor speaks slightingly of Chicago because maids instead of men answer the door-bells there. What would Mr. Astor say of Kansas? There a great many refined, cultivated, intelligent ladies, heads of households, answer their own door-bells, as did Mr. Astor's grandmother, no doubt, if she had a door-bell. In New York there are thousands of coachmen and footmen and housemaids and butlers, all clad in livery to distinguish them from their superiors. In Kansas they neither uniform the domestics, tip the waiters, nor amputate the horses' tails. New York owns a hundred silk hats and dress-coats and tailor-made gowns to every one in Kansas. The banquet in New York is more gorgeously decorated than in Kansas, with more flowers, more silver, more cut glass. The banqueter revels in half a dozen glasses of different shapes and colors for as many beverages. In Kansas there is but one goblet and one beverage; but my observation is that gout and dyspepsia are rarer and the after-dinner speeches better.

You cannot sit in your room in a Kansas hotel and have brought to you one or more of fifty-six different kinds of drinks by merely touching the button in the proper way,—you can in New York. There are few clubs in Kansas, and no young men of leisure. In New York are to be seen the signs of milliners and modistes "by appointment" of this or that European personage. And these signs bring custom. In Kansas only postmasters exist by appointment, and that of the President of the United States. Kansas has no Patriarchs' ball,—and no French ball either. New York has the chaperon,—and doubtless needs her. In Kansas the young men are not young wolves, neither are the young women young sheep. Of course, no Kansas man could write such a book as Mr. Ward McAllister's,—certainly not and remain a leader of society, in good standing with intelligent people. Kansas society lacks ritual and regalia, but it does not lack sincerity, friendliness, wit, and sense.

But the impatience of the New York "Evening Post" was directed mainly at recent political phenomena in Kansas. The implication is that the people here are not fit to govern themselves or to participate in the government of the country. Has not the political history of Kansas been quite as satisfactory and given quite as many evidences of civilization as the political history of New York city?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If vigorous patriotism, if prevalent honesty in the administration of public affairs, if respect for law and obedience to it,—are evidences of civilization, then Kansas must be quite as civilized as New York. Taking Mr. Theodore Roosevelt's recent "History of New York City" and skimming the table of contents from 1775 down, one strikes such hints as these: "Lukewarmness about Revolution," "Mob Violence," "Tory Plots," "Doctors' Mob Riots," "Political Riots," "The Spoils System," "Riots," "Election Frauds," "Municipal Bribery," "Police Riots," "Secession Influences," "Draft Riots," "Hibernian Riots," "Political Corruption," "Stock Swindling," "The Tweed Ring," etc. New York city was the stronghold of disloyalty in 1776; and in January, 1861, its Mayor, in a message to the Common Council, "proclaimed disunion to be a fixed fact, and proposed that New York should herself secede and become a free city with but a nominal duty on imports." The New York draft-riot was more horrible and barbarous than anything ever charged to the bushwhackers and guerillas of the South. The rich and the poor were plundered. Inoffensive negroes were put to death with torture. Charitable institutions were attacked. The attempt was made to burn a hospital filled with wounded soldiers. New York state and New York city were unable or unwilling to crush the mob, and regiments of troops had to be withdrawn from the front at a critical time to restore order. These troops attacked the rioters, as Mr. Roosevelt says, with a commendable desire to do them harm. They did them harm, shooting some twelve hundred of them before the affair was ended.

That distinguished citizen of New York, Captain Kidd, first set the fashion, and piracy has flourished on Manhattan Island ever since. It met with a temporary discouragement in the downfall of Captain Tweed; but if the "Evening Post" is to be believed, it has risen again in the person of Captain Croker. There may have been a period in the early part of the century when the city was able to govern itself, and did; but certainly for a long time it has been governed by bandits. It seems to be absolutely helpless in their hands. The word "bandit" is putting it mildly, and perhaps an apology is due to those honest freebooters who carry on their business openly and by force rather than by bribery and cunning. History contains no other such record of corrupt misrule as that of New York city. The city has so long and steadily looted its own treasury that it has lost all self-respect. It cannot provide itself with the common necessities of life,—for example, adequate transportation facilities,—because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it has no confidence in its own honesty. And so it goes on packing itself into such conveyances as there are, pell-mell, men, women, and children, in the most uncomfortable, unsanitary, and indecent masses, and so getting up and down the island as best it can. The politics of New York seem to be hopelessly corrupt. The statement has been made by a person in a position to know, that a distinguished member of Congress from New York staked more than a hundred thousand dollars on the result of the last election, and that a distinguished judge of a New York court acted as "book-maker" in this and other similar transactions. I have been told by a wealthy and reputable business man, himself a member of Tammany, that at one time, through the workings of competition, the price of votes in the city got extravagantly high, and that to cut down election expenses the Tammany and the Republican bosses came together and agreed upon the maximum price to be paid for a vote,—in fact, formed a trust, a sort of a voting-trust, for the oppression of the poor but dishonest elector.

If there is a community in the United States whose history proves it unfit to rule itself, and totally unfit to participate in the federal government, that community would seem to be New York city. Nor is New York city—though the rottenest—the only rotten spot in the Empire State. Brooklyn, Buffalo, and other large cities have now, or have had from time to time, their corrupt and omnipotent oligarchies, their eras of venality and plunder. The State is sixty per cent urban; the cities are in control; and their sewage has been easily perceptible in the stream of public events at Albany from the days of Tweed down. The Hills and the Platts have not made State history to be proud of.

Kansas was well—and, in the main, honestly—governed during the '60's, the '70's, and '80's. In 1890 came the revolution. No defence will here be made—none can be made—of the many absurdities which the Populist party has from time to time mistaken for its principles, and which it has from time to time abandoned. That party has done incalculable harm to the reputation of Kansas. It was condemned by the people at the last election, and will be duly executed without doubt at the next. Its many conscientious and thoughtful adherents have seen their great blunder and have discovered the character of their leaders. But there are certain things to be noted in regard to this party and its history. It sprang into being as the result of general financial distress, such as worked a revolution in New York, Ohio, and elsewhere, at the last election. Some Republicans, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among them many old soldiers, desired to see whether a political kick would not raise the price of corn or bring relief in some other way. From principle or prejudice, or from both, they could not turn Democrats, and so they joined the old adherents of Peter Cooper of New York and Benjamin Butler of Massachusetts, and the new adherents of Henry George of New York and Edward Bellamy of Massachusetts, and formed a new party. This is the whole thing in a nutshell. But the new party never would have accomplished any tangible political results had not the Democratic party conveniently forgotten all its principles that it might spite its old enemy and draw nearer to the post-offices. The Populists are and always have been in the minority. They have never had a vote much larger proportionately than Mr. Henry George's vote was a few years ago, when he came so near to being elected mayor of New York. The "Evening Post" probably does not regard Mr. George's idea as materially less pernicious than the Populist idea.

The Populists have never had control of both branches of the Kansas legislature, so that it cannot be told what laws they would have passed if they had been clothed with full power and responsibility. As it is, they have aided in giving the State considerable good legislation,—the ballot and bribery laws, for example, and very large educational appropriations; and of seriously bad legislation there has been very little. They have put into office many incompetent men and not a few scoundrels, but this was not altogether from choice. They lacked capable men who were honest, and they were fooled by the demagogues. They elected Mr. Peffer to the United States Senate. Mr. Peffer is an ordinary man with several extraordinary delusions. He is honestly desirous of ridding the country of some stupendous and admitted evils. It is certain that he does not in the least know how to do this, but no one has yet appeared who does. There have probably been very few senatorial elections in the United States in the last thirty years which were absolutely free from taint of bribery. Mr. Peffer's was one of these. He gave no money, he promised no Federal offices. Senators Peffer and Martin may not be brilliant statesmen, but if the "Evening Post" had the power, and were compelled to elect whether it would be represented by Peffer and Martin or by Hill and Murphy, would it not make a very wry face and choose the former? Is Peffer as serious a menace to all good things which go to make civilization as Hill?

When the last Kansas legislature met, a contest arose, but alto-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gether unlike that which has lately agitated the State of New Jersey. The Senate and the Governor declared for the Dunsmore House, so called. This was the Populist House. Unquestionably many Populists believed it to be the true House. The feeling over the matter grew very bitter. The Governor attempted to make an unwarrantable use of the militia. The dispute went so far that at one time there were some thousands of men under arms in Topeka. The strain was intense, and the danger of bloodshed imminent. Yet not a drop of blood was shed. In spite of the immense excitement there was scarcely a scuffle during the entire controversy. There was no drunkenness, no lawlessness, not the smallest semblance of a riot. The Supreme Court decided the question against the Governor and the Senate, and the people submitted. The "Evening Post" is right in condemning this Governor,—let it at the same time do justice to the self-restraint of the people. The "Evening Post" is right in condemning this Governor,—but if it had to choose whether it would be ruled by Mr. Croker or Mr. Llewelling, would it choose Croker?

What the outcome will be of New York conditions, so far as civilization is concerned, is a matter of dim speculation. The people are heterogeneous. They are an aggregation of individual and generic strangers. They have no unity, no common impulses, no general ideals. The city is not without public-spirited citizens, but it seems to be wholly without public spirit. The statue of Liberty was long without a pedestal; the Grant monument tarried; the World's Fair went to Chicago. New York is a magnificent city. It contains a vast amount of stalwart goodness. It owes its greatness and strength to the country of which it is a part and to which it belongs. More knowledge of that country, more feeling of obligation toward it, more sympathy and unity with it, might perhaps advance the cause of civilization both on the island and on the mainland.

The people of Kansas are homogeneous; they are of one race. They have inherited common impulses, common customs, common religion, and common ideals. They are by no means a perfect people, though it may be said that this argument would seem to make them so: they are not perfect, but at the same time this country and the cause of good government and higher civilization are receiving and will receive as much good and as little bad, as much help and as little hindrance, from the State of Kansas, as from any other State in the Union.

J. W. GLEED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A GENTLE WARNING TO LECTURERS.

"FEW of us," says Mr. Walter Bagehot in one of his most cynical moods, "can bear the theory of our amusements. It is essential to the pride of man to believe that he is industrious."

Now, is it industry or a love of sport which makes us sit in long and solemn rows in an oppressively hot room, blinking at glaring lights, breathing a vitiated air, wriggling on straight and narrow chairs, and listening, as well as heat and fatigue and discomfort will permit, to a lecture which might just as well have been read peacefully by our own firesides? Do we do this thing for amusement or for intellectual gain? Outside, the winter sun is setting clearly in a blue-green sky. People are chatting gayly in the streets. Friends are drinking cups of fragrant tea in pleasant lamp-lit rooms. There are concerts, perhaps, or *matinées*, where the deft comedian provokes continuous laughter. No; it is not amusement that we seek in the lecture-hall. Too many really amusing things may be done on a winter afternoon. Too many possible pleasures lie in wait for every spare half-hour. We can harbor no delusions on that score.

Is it industry, then, that packs us side by side in serried Amazonian ranks, broken here and there by a stray and downcast man? But on the library shelves stand thick as autumn leaves the unread books. Hidden away in obscure corners are the ripe old authors whom we know by name alone. The mist of an unspoken tongue veils from us the splendid treasures of antiquity, and we comfort ourselves with glib commonplaces about "the sympathetic study of translations." No; it can hardly be the keen desire of culture which makes us patient listeners to endless lectures. Culture is not so easy of access. It is not a thing passed lightly from hand to hand. It is the reward of an intelligent quest, of delicate intuitions, of a broad and generous sympathy with all that is best in the world. It has been nobly defined by Mr. Symonds as "the raising of the intellectual faculties to their highest potency by means of conscious training." We cannot gain this fine mastery over ourselves by absorbing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—or forgetting—a mass of details upon disconnected subjects,—"a thousand particulars," says Addison, "which I would not have my mind burdened with for a Vatican." If we will sit down and seriously try to reckon up our winnings in years of lecture-going, we may yet find ourselves reluctant converts to Mr. Bagehot's cruel conclusions. It is the old, old search for a royal road to learning. It is the old, old effort at a compromise which cheats us out of both pleasure and profit. It is the old, old determination to seek some short cut to acquirements, which, like "conversing with ingenious men," may save us, says Bishop Berkeley, from "the drudgery of reading and thinking."

The necessity of knowing a little about a great many things is the most grievous burden of our day. It deprives us of leisure on the one hand, and of scholarship on the other. At times we envy the happy Hermit of Prague, who never saw pen or ink; at times we think somewhat wistfully of the sedate and dignified methods of the past, when students, to use Sir Walter Scott's illustration, paid their tickets at the door, instead of scrambling over the walls to distinction. It shows a good deal of agility and self-reliance to scale the walls; and such athletic interlopers, albeit a trifle disordered in appearance, are apt to boast of their unaided prowess: how with "little Latin and less Greek" they have become—not Shakespeares indeed, nor even Scotts—but prominent, very prominent citizens indeed. The notion is gradually gaining ground that common-school education is as good as college education; that extension lectures and summer classes are acceptable substitutes for continuous study and mental discipline; that reading translations of the classics is better, because easier, than reading the classics themselves; and that attending a "Congress" of specialists gives us, in some mysterious fashion, a very respectable knowledge of their specialties. It is after this manner that we enjoy, in all its varied aspects, that energetic idleness which Mr. Bagehot recommends as a deliberate sedative to our restless self-esteem.

Yet the sacrifice of time alone is worth some sorrowful consideration. We laugh at the droning pedants of the old German universities who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had well-nigh drowned the world with words. The Tübingen chancellor, Penziger, gave, it is said, four hundred and fifty-nine lectures on the prophet Jeremiah, and over fifteen hundred lectures on Isaiah; while the Viennese theologian, Hazelbach, lectured for twenty-two consecutive years on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first chapter of Isaiah, and was cruelly cut off by death before he had finished with his theme. But the bright side of this picture is that only students—and theological students at that—attended these limitless dissertations. Theology was then a battle-field, and the heavy weapons forged for the combat were presumed to be as deadly as they were cumbersome. During all those twenty-two years in which Herr Hazelbach held forth so mercilessly, German maidens and German matrons formed no part of his audience. They at least had other and better things to do. German artisans and German tradesmen trouble themselves little about Isaiah. German ploughmen went about their daily toil as placidly as if Herr Hazelbach had been born a mute. The sleepy world had not then awakened to its duty of disseminating knowledge broadcast and in small doses, so that our education, as Dr. Johnson discontentedly observed of the education of the Scotch, is like bread in a besieged town,—"every man gets a little, but no man gets a full meal."

What we lack in quantity, however, we are pleased to make up in variety. We range freely over a mass of subjects from the religion of the Phœnicians to the poets of Australia, and from the Song of Solomon to the latest electrical invention. We have lectures in the morning upon Plato and Aristotle, and in the afternoon upon Emerson and Arthur Hugh Clough. We take a short course of German metaphysics,—which is supposed to be easily compressed into six lectures—and follow it up immediately with another on French art or the folk-lore of the North American Indians. No topic is too vast to be handled deftly, and finished up in a few afternoons. A fortnight for the Renaissance, a week for Greek architecture, ten days for Chaucer, three weeks for anthropology. It is amazing how far we can go in a winter, when we travel at this rate of speed. "What under the sun is bringing all the women after Hegel?" asked a puzzled librarian not very long ago. "There isn't one of his books left in the library, and twenty women come in a day to ask for him." It was explained to this custodian that a popular lecturer had been dwelling with some enthusiasm upon Hegel, and that the sudden demand for the philosopher was a result of his contagious eloquence. It seemed for the nonce like a revival of pantheism; but in two weeks every volume was back in its place, and the gray dust of neglect was settling down as of yore upon each hoary head. The women, fickle as in the days of the troubadours, had wandered far from German erudition, and were by that time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrestling with the Elizabethan poets or the constitutional history of republics. The sun of philosophy had set.

One rather dismal result of this rapid transit is the amount of material which each lecture is required to hold, and which each lecture-goer is expected to remember. A few centuries of Egyptian history or of mediæval song are packed down by some system of mental hydraulic pressure into a single hour's discourse; and, when they escape, they seem vast enough to fill our lives for a week. "When Macaulay talks," complained Lady Ashburton tartly, "I am not only overflowed with learning, but I stand in the slops." We have much the same uncomfortable sensation at an afternoon lecture, when the tide of information, of dry, formidable, relentless facts, rises higher and higher, and our spirits sink lower and lower with every fresh development. "The need of limit, the feasibility of performance," has not yet dawned upon the new educators who have taken the world in hand; and, as a consequence, we, the students, have never learned to survey our own intellectual boundaries. We assume in the first place that we have an intelligent interest in literature, science, and history, art, architecture, and archæology; and, in the second, that it is possible for us to learn a moderate amount about all these things without any unreasonable exertion. This double delusion lures us feebly on until we have listened to so much, and remembered so little, that we are a good deal like the infant Paul Dombey wondering in pathetic perplexity whether a verb always agreed with an ancient Briton, or three times four was Taurus a bull.

"When all can read, and books are plentiful, lectures are unnecessary," says Dr. Johnson, who hated "by-roads in education," and novel devices—or devices which were novel a hundred and thirty years ago—for softening and abridging hard study. He hated also to be asked the kind of questions which we are now so fond of answering in the columns of our journals and magazines. What should a child learn first? How should a boy be taught? What course of study would he recommend an intelligent youth to pursue? "Let him take a course of chemistry, or a course of rope-dancing, or a course of anything to which he is inclined," was the great scholar's petulant reply to one of these repeated inquiries; and, though it sounds ill-natured, we have some human sympathy for the pardonable irritation which prompted it. Dr. Johnson, I am well aware, is not a popular authority to quote in behalf of any cause one wishes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to advance; but his heterodoxy in the matter of lectures is supported openly by Charles Lamb, and furtively by some living men of letters, who strive, though with no great show of temerity, to stem the ever-increasing current of popular instruction. One eminent scholar, being entreated to deliver a course of lectures on a somewhat abstruse theme, replied that if people really desired information on that subject, and if they could read, he begged to refer them to two books he had written several years before. By perusing these volumes, which were easy of access, they would know all that he once knew, and a great deal more than he knew at the present time, as he had unhappily forgotten much that was in them. It would be simpler, he deemed, and it would be cheaper, than bringing him across the ocean to repeat the same matter in lectures.

As for Lamb, we have not only his frankly-stated opinion, but—what is much more diverting—we have also the unconscious confession of a purely human weakness with which it is pleasant to sympathize. Like all the rest of us, this charming and fallible genius found that heroic efforts in the future cost less than very moderate exertions in the present. He was warmly attached to Coleridge, and he held him in sincere veneration. When the poet came to London in 1816, we find Lamb writing to Wordsworth very enthusiastically, and yet with a vague undercurrent of apprehension:

"Coleridge is absent but four miles, and the neighborhood of such a man is as exciting as the presence of fifty ordinary persons. 'Tis enough to be within the whiff and wind of his genius for us not to possess our souls in quiet. If I lived with him, or with the author of 'The Excursion,' I should in a very little time lose my own identity, and be dragged along in the currents of other people's thoughts, hampered in a net."

This is well enough by way of anticipation; but later on, when Coleridge is a fixed star in the London skies, and is preparing to give his lectures on Shakespeare and English poetry, Lamb's kind heart warms to his perpetually impecunious friend. He writes now to Payne Collier, with little enthusiasm, but with great earnestness, bespeaking his interest and assistance. He reminds Collier of his friendship and admiration for Coleridge, and bids him remember that he and all his family attended the poet's lectures five years before. He tells him alluringly that this is a brand-new course, with nothing metaphysical about it, and adds: "There are particular reasons just now, and have been for the last twenty years, why he [Coleridge] should succeed. He will do so with a little encouragement."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Doubtless; but it is worthy of note that the next time the subject is mentioned is in a letter to Mrs. Wordsworth, written more than two months later. The lectures are now in progress; very successful, we hear; but—Lamb has been to none of them. He intends to go soon, of course,—so do we always; but, in the mean while he is treating resolution with a good deal of zest, and making the best plea he can for his defalcation. With desperate candor he writes:

> "I mean to hear some of the course, but lectures are not much to my taste, whatever the lecturer may be. If read, they are dismal flat, and you can't think why you are brought together to hear a man read his works, which you could read so much better at leisure yourself. If delivered extempore, I am always in pain lest the gift of utterance should suddenly fail the orator in the middle, as it did me at the dinner given in honor of me at the London Tavern. 'Gentlemen,' said I, and there I stopped; the rest my feelings were under the necessity of supplying."

We can judge pretty well from this letter just how many of those lectures on Shakespeare Lamb was likely to hear; and all doubts are set at rest when we find Coleridge, the following winter, endeavoring to lure his reluctant friend to another course by the presentation of a complimentary ticket. Even this device fails of its wonted success. Lamb is eloquent in thanks, and lame in excuses. He has been in an "incessant hurry." He was unable to go on the evening he was expected because it was the night of Kenney's new comedy, "which has utterly failed,"—this is mentioned as soothing to Coleridge's wounded feelings. He has mistaken his dates, and supposed there would be no lectures in Christmas week. He is as eager to vindicate himself as Miss Edgeworth's Rosamond, and he is as sanguine as ever about the future. "I trust to hear many a course yet;" and with this splendid resolution, which is made without a pang, he wanders brightly off to a more engaging topic.

It is a charming little bit of comedy, and has, withal, such a distinctly modern touch, that we might fancy it enacted in this year of grace eighteen hundred and ninety-four, by any of our weak and erring friends.

AGNES REPPLIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS FARM MACHINERY DESTROYED FARM LIFE?

THE late President Garfield once told me that, having a small field of wheat on his Mentor farm, he thought he would hire a man to cut the grain with a cradle, because there was not enough of it to warrant the use of a harvesting-machine. He had great difficulty in finding a man who knew how to swing a cradle and was willing to undertake the hard physical labor. The young men on the neighboring farms knew nothing of the use of the old implement, and the older men did not wish to undertake the job. A single lifetime has spanned the entire period from the sickle to the self-binder and the header and the gigantic California machine, which, propelled by twenty-six horses, moves across the wheat-fields, cutting and threshing as it goes.

The McCormick reaper was invented in 1831, but was clumsy at first. One man went afoot and drove the horses, and another man trudged along by the side of the machine with a rake and pulled the fallen grain off the cutting-board. The next advance was to provide seats for the driver and for the man with the rake. Then came a device by which the machine itself pushed off the grain in quantities of the right size for binding, the binding being done by hand and with straw withes by men who followed it. Finally came the perfected twine-binder of the present day. The header, which is the favorite reaping-machine on the Pacific Coast, was of a little later date and grew out of the conditions of a dry climate, where it is important to cut the grain as rapidly as possible after it ripens, to avoid loss from shelling. The header is propelled by six horses and steered by a little wheel in the rear, which acts like a rudder on a ship. It clips off the heads of the grain and delivers them to wagons driven beside it, which haul to the stack or the thresher. Usually the threshing is done at once, while the cutting is in progress. The daily capacity of this machine is about double that of the ordinary binder, but it is not much used east of the Rocky Mountains, for the reason that the heads of the grain should be nearly uniformly ripe for the best economic results.

I do not make much account of the huge combined reaper and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thresher, because its economic value is not yet fully demonstrated and its use appears to be limited to the Pacific Coast, where, in the rainless summer, the wheat-heads mature thoroughly upon the stalk. Practically, the modern self-binder and the modern header represent the acme of reaping inventions. The man with the sickle could not cut an acre of wheat in a day. The man on the header cuts twenty-five acres. He and his machine are as good as a platoon of men slowly moving across the harvest-field half a century ago.

In the methods of preparing the soil for the crop, the development of machinery has not been as remarkable, but it is nevertheless important. The old plough, much improved since it had a mould-board of wood covered with sheet-iron, still survives in many forms, and is likely to continue long, for it alone is adapted to rough ground. Seated on a sulky-plough with two shares, the farmer of to-day drives his team of four or five horses across his field, doubling his former capacity of work. Gang-ploughs with three and with four shares are made for use on large farms, but they are not much approved for the reason that they require too many animals for the best economic use. Still, ploughing is relatively the slowest of all farm operations. The new inventions in general use only enable the man, instead of walking, to ride, and to control the position of two shares with a lever instead of one with the hand applied to the old plough-tail. For many years thoughtful farmers have realized that the great need in the way of further labor-saving invention, as applied to farm labor, is a cheaper and more rapid method of ploughing. The ideal is the gang-plough with a dozen or more shares, drawn across the field by steam-traction engines. Now such ploughs and such engines exist. I saw one at work the past season on a five-thousand-acre barley farm in the Gallatin valley, in Montana.

For twenty years steam-ploughing has been attempted here and there—in Kansas, in California, in the Dakotas, in Australia, and in Europe; but it seems as far away from general adoption as ever. The difficulty is that the heavy traction engine will not move on wet ground and is liable to accidents, which make it as helpless as a locomotive off the track. Every large farmer that has tried steam-ploughing has done so tentatively, with plenty of horses and men to do the bulk of his work and to help the big engine out of any trouble it may get into by reason of rough ground, mice-holes, or breakages of machinery. The superintendent of the big barley farm once told me that, allowing for delays, accidents, and repairs, he could not figure out any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saving for his steam-plough over men and mules. Possibly the time will come when the farmer can fire up his engine and haul his ploughs merrily across his level fields, and can use the same machine to haul his grain to market and bring back his fuel; but up to this time nature has blocked the path of invention in this direction.

Improvements in the harrowing process in the direction of saving labor keep pace with those in ploughing. Very much larger harrows are used than formerly, or three harrows are geared together, and a man by driving six horses in front of one of these combination-harrows can get over three times as much ground as formerly. There is a proportionate increase of animal-power to the work done, but the man-power remains the same. In the labor of seeding, no saving was made by machinery from the earliest dawn of history down to our own day, when drills and broadcast seeders were invented. In my boyhood the sower marched across the field with bag slung from his shoulder and scattered the seed by the handful, just as was done in Egypt in the time of the Pharaohs. The late improvements in apparatus for seeding have been in the doubling of the width of the machine. Formerly two horses hauled a six-foot drill; now four haul a twelve-foot drill; so that with a doubling of horse-power there is a saving of one man.

All inventions seek to eliminate, as far as possible, the man from the work of the farm. The first threshers turned out the grain and chaff together, leaving the winnowing for a separate process; then came the combination of the fanning-mill with the threshing-machine, and also the straw-carrier, which takes to the stack the straw that formerly had to be pitched by hand. Now there is a device that carries the bundles to the machine, cuts the twine bands in transit, and delivers the bundles head first to the revolving jaws. This saves the labor of two feeders and two band-cutters. The thresher, which used to be run by horses, is now propelled by a portable steam-engine, which burns straw for fuel, and which, when its work on one farm is done, can use its own power to travel to another. With the exception of the threshing-machine, there is no application of steam-power to farming, for we may leave out of the account the steam-plough as an interesting toy rather than a practical labor-saving device. All the gain of the man over the labor of tillage in other directions is achieved by the increase of animal-power. The man ploughs twice as much as formerly and harrows twice as much because he drives twice as many horses. His gain in seeding and reaping comes from the use of horse-power largely in place of his own muscles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have not space to speak here in detail of the labor-saving inventions that cut, spread, rake, and stack hay, that till the ground and kill the weeds between the rows of Indian corn, that husk and shell the ears, that cut fodder and grind feed for animals, that, in short, perform a hundred functions in farm life which used to be done by unaided manual toil. At a very moderate estimate, the farmer of our day with the help of machinery exerts a productive force equal to that of three men in the days of his grandfather.

Now, this enormous change must have produced effects upon farm life and on the character of the farming population. Let us first inquire as to its influence on the average farm acreage. My own observations in recent years have been limited to the region between Wisconsin and the Pacific Coast, which includes the great-plains country of northern Minnesota, the two Dakotas, and Manitoba, with occasional glimpses at Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and California. On our vast northwestern prairies farm machinery has had the best opportunity to exert its full influence. This machinery was nearly perfected when settlement first followed railroads across these prairies; conditions were all new and the settlers as a rule bought the best apparatus in the market. There are no stumps or stones or steep hillsides to interfere with the free working of the reapers and mowers, the gang-ploughs and the seeders. A farmer can now till one hundred and sixty acres with about the same amount of labor that was formerly required to till forty or fifty. Nobody now wants to farm on the prairies with less than a quarter section of land—one hundred and sixty acres. Every competent farmer owning a quarter section desires to buy another quarter. It is more economical to farm three hundred and twenty acres than one hundred and sixty, for the teams can be kept more constantly at work and there is fuller employment for the plant of farm machinery.

Another potent consideration in creating the universal desire for more land to till is the low price of farm products. When wheat brought a dollar a bushel a farmer could make a good living from a quarter section; but with wheat selling at from fifty to sixty cents he cannot, unless he can add some other source of revenue to his single crop of wheat. He must raise oats or barley for feed and leave some of his land in pasture and hay-field; so that if he gets two thousand bushels of his single market crop he is doing very well. With a gross income of twelve hundred dollars, out of which must come his harvesting and threshing expenses, his twine, his new machinery, his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taxes and a multitude of incidentals, he does not have enough left to maintain his family in comfort, especially in treeless regions, where fuel is a heavy outlay. If the old prices for grain could be restored it is possible that the influence of farm machinery on farm areas would go no further than to produce the quarter-section farm, save in exceptional cases of men of executive ability and considerable resources in capital, who would carry on larger operations. Whether the half-section farmer now aims to own an entire section depends on the character of the man. To work a mile square of land requires doubling up the force of animals and the equipment of machinery and involves large expenditure for hired labor and large risks on the success of the crop. Section farms are numerous in Minnesota and the two Dakotas, but I do not think their number is increasing. I regard the three-hundred-and-twenty-acre farm as about the natural limit of present tendencies in regions where there is nothing to hinder the free working of agricultural machinery.

The so-called bonanza wheat-farms of the Northwest and the big farms of the California valleys must not be ascribed to the influence of farm machinery. They would not be possible without such machinery, but they grew out of transient conditions that no longer prevail—the California farms out of the old Spanish land-grants, and the Minnesota and Dakota farms out of the Congressional grants to railroads. The history of the Northwestern big farms is that the land was purchased from the railroad companies with depreciated stock and cost originally about one dollar per acre. Other lands, in the alternate sections not granted to the railroads, were secured under the pre-emption laws, since repealed, by the employees of the large farmers filing on quarter sections and turning them over when title had been secured.

The low price of wheat and the higher price of land have changed the whole aspect of large farming. There is no bonanza in the big farm now; it makes but a moderate profit on the capital it represents in average crop years, and with a bad crop it barely pays running expenses. It requires as careful management as a factory. It has its economies and its attractions and it will survive for many years; but its epoch has passed. Many of the big farms in the valley of the Red River of the North, where they are most numerous and are operated to the best advantage, are being steadily reduced by sales to small farmers. These lands now bring from fifteen to twenty-five dollars an acre, and the desire to realize the large profit on the original invest-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment as well as the experience of short-crop years combine to make the owners glad to reduce their holdings. It thus appears that large farms—farms managed by superintendents and foremen and employing large forces of men, who are discharged when threshing and fall ploughing are over—are not now so profitable as to invite new investments of capital in their formation. Such farms are destined to diminish in number from decade to decade. Whether the mile-square farm and the farm consisting of two or three sections are destined to become more numerous by consolidation of smaller holdings is a question largely dependent for its answer, I believe, on the price of food-products in the future. If grain continues to decline, the small farmer who is not able to buy more land will be dispossessed by his more fortunate and more competent neighbor. The problem of prices has become almost painful in its interest to the farmers. Here is the reaper doing as much work as six men could do in the days of cradling and rake-binding and doing it with one man. The other five men who formerly lived on the land and helped to consume its products are gone to the towns. The machine is producing what they formerly produced and is consuming nothing save horse-feed. In all other farm processes, too, we see the elimination of the man.

We must take into account, as operating to check the tendency toward the consolidation of farms, first, the growing pressure of population on land and the fact that we have no large new regions to settle that are capable of growing wheat. The land is a fixed quantity; but we add a million to our national population every year. When consumption overtakes production, prices will rise and small farms will afford a comfortable livelihood. The Eastern reader has no doubt been educated out of the notion that the great blank spaces on the map in the far West are possible farming areas. They are not. They belong to the vast arid belt. Farmers have already invaded this belt to their cost and been forced to draw back. The arid belt is fit only for sheep and cattle, save where little strips along the streams can be irrigated. We can fill up the eastern parts of the Dakotas, where population is still scant, and then we shall have done with any important increase of our wheat acreage. Kansas and Nebraska are already settled as far west as rain-fall warrants tillage. I do not take into account the strip of wonderfully fertile country in eastern Washington and northern Idaho, because that is already better settled than either of the Dakotas. We shall have no more new agricultural States and no very great increase of the food-producing areas in the older

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States. The artificial rain-maker has been suppressed as a fraud and the artesian-well fad has had its day. Irrigation from streams will go on, but it never can redeem one acre in ten thousand of the immense arid and mountainous spaces that lie between the Rockies and the fertile plains of the Mississippi Valley and that cover also the greater part of the country west of the continental divide. There is hope for the farmer that prices will advance, and with the realization of that hope will come a check on the movement toward larger farms.

The influence of large farms on country life is unquestionably deplorable. The summer population of the big wheat-farm is composed mainly of a drifting class of laborers with no attachment to the soil and with no interest in their work beyond getting their pay. In the winter they go to the pineries or hang about the cities looking for odd jobs. The winter population of the farm is reduced to a few men who take care of the stock, and perhaps one of the foremen who has a family. Usually the manager and his family go to some town to pass the dead season. A snowy waste takes the place of the tilled fields, and loneliness reigns. The purpose of large farming is to exploit the land for what money it will yield and not to build up a permanent community with love of locality and an organized social life.

On the farms which embrace one or two sections the conditions are better, for the farmer usually lives with his family the year round upon his land; but the nearest neighbors are at least a mile distant, and unsold school sections and tracts held by Eastern speculators often make wider gaps between the farmsteads, so that there is not much visiting back and forth between the farmers' families. Even where the farms average only half a section each, no such neighborly life is practicable as is found in the older States, where the houses are hardly a quarter of a mile apart along the country roads and where there is a village every four or five miles. To the loneliness and monotony of rural life on the prairies must be attributed the remarkable prevalence of insanity among farmers and still more among farmers' wives in the great-plains country beyond the Mississippi. Gatherings of neighbors for social pleasure are rare. The men gather at the country stores to talk politics and crops; but the women are left to themselves in the lonely farm-houses.

An interesting question might be raised as to the influence of labor-saving machinery on the intellectual development of the farmer of the present day. Most men of the generation that is passing away who have given thought to this question will, I imagine, say that it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has not been beneficial and will argue that the farmer of their boyhood, who had to do a multitude of things that are now done by factories or by farm machinery, was a brighter, more original, and more manly fellow than his successor of this day. He made his own axe-helves, plough-handles, and flails, split fence-rails and built fences, did a little carpentry, cobbling, and blacksmithing, and sharpened his wits by many makeshifts and contrivances; and his wife carried on a little factory in the house, where wool was spun, dyed, and woven, clothing was made, and fruits were dried and preserved. Now everything is bought at the stores and all the little farm arts and handicrafts have departed from the rural districts. I admit that some loss of intellectual fibre must have resulted from this great change, but I hold that it has been more than made up by the universal habit of reading that has come with more leisure and with the multiplication of cheap books and newspapers. Instead of spending the evenings shelling corn by the light of a tallow candle, the farmer now reads the newspapers in the glow of a kerosene lamp, and his wife, released from the drudgery of spinning and knitting, will be found reading a novel or a magazine. Farm machinery now gives the farmer an amount of leisure unknown in the old times of hand labor. All the really hard work is done by machines. We cannot suppose this to be detrimental to the intellect and character of the farm population. Leisure is the golden dream of the working classes all over the world, and if the modern farmer has secured release in part from the grinding toil that made of his father an old man at fifty, wrinkled and rheumatic, who shall say that he has been injured thereby in brain force or moral stamina?

I believe that we are now in a transition period in agriculture. The influence of machinery has been fully exerted. It is doubtful whether the next century will see any important new inventions that will further eliminate the man from the land and do his work with cog-wheels, levers, and knives. There are no more fertile lands on the globe to be conquered by civilization and to increase the food-supply. With growth of population will come better prices for farm products. Farm life will become more attractive. The tendency to large farms will be checked. A hundred acres, even with exclusive grain farming, will afford a good living to a family. Better times for American agriculture are not far off.

E. V. Smalley.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NOTABLE NEW BOOK — MRS. WARD'S "MARCELLA."

"WHEN the door closed upon him, Marcella, stretched in the darkness, shed the bitterest tears that had ever yet been hers,—tears which transformed her youth—which baptized her, as it were, into the fulness of our tragic life." In these words Mrs. Humphry Ward strikes the keynote of her dealings with the men and women whose characters she portrays and whose destinies she reports. Marcella, like Robert Elsmere and David Grieve, enters into "the fulness of our tragic life." Each of the novels which bear these names is a chapter torn out of the book of life, and as one endeavors to formulate the deepest impression which they convey in common, he is reminded of Goethe's comment on reading Shakspeare for the first time, that he felt as if he had been turning the pages of the book of fate, with the hurricane of life tossing its leaves to and fro. Certainly no novelist of our time has felt the common destiny with such passionate sympathy, or has described the experiences of the most sensitive and thoughtful natures of the time with a power so closely allied to heartfelt knowledge of the phases of life with which she deals.

In the earlier books the sympathy was too intense for the highest artistic effectiveness; the novelist was too close to her theme; the strain upon thought and feeling was too continuous; there was a lack of perspective and of shading. Neither in "Robert Elsmere" nor in "David Grieve" was there any lack of dramatic power or of the artistic instinct, feeling, and skill which search the recesses of character, discern the decisive tendencies, and fasten upon the critical moments; but the pictures were too sombre; there was too little light; the ease, the lightness, the variety of tone and touch of the great artist were lacking. There was peculiar richness of intellectual quality; there was the power of culture; there was deep human feeling and a great force of passion,—passion that gave the bare processes of thought dramatic interest and value: but the fulness of power that lays hold on humor, and sets the tragic fact in relation to the thousand and one lighter aspects of every human career, was present only inciden-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tally. It was as if George Eliot had told us the pathetic story of Hetty Sorrel without relieving the strain by the homely and telling humor of Mrs. Poyser; as if Shakespeare had sent Lear out into the storm without the companionship of the Fool. In her earlier stories Mrs. Ward's mood was too strenuous, and her work carried with it that impression of toil from which the finalities of expression entirely escape. In "Robert Elsmere" and "David Grieve" a great talent was at work; but the question whether behind the talent there was that originating force which we call genius, was left unanswered.

In "Marcella" that question is answered beyond a doubt. One no longer asks himself whether he is in contact with a powerful and trained mind employing the resources of fiction to formulate and illustrate certain views of life, or whether he is under the spell of a native gift for narration and characterization. In her latest story Mrs. Ward is not less serious and moving, but she is far more artistic, and therefore far more effective. She has mastered her subject instead of being mastered by it; she is, first and foremost, a novelist. She has a story to tell which deals with the most pressing and oppressive phase of human experience to-day: but she never forgets that she is dealing with literature, not with economics; and that, for the purposes of art, the experiences are of significance only so far as they force the undeveloped qualities of character into action and so become part of the very substance of the drama.

George Eliot began with a great natural dramatic force, and in her earlier stories the current is so powerful that it easily carries with it a mass of ethical convictions; but in her last work the ethical and the philosophical so outweigh the dramatic that the story-telling impulse becomes inadequate to the task. In "The Mill on the Floss" the stream of narrative sweeps onward as the flood rushed past the old mill in the last great tragic moment; in "Daniel Deronda" it is so sluggish that one is reminded of Thoreau's story of the barn that was carried from its foundation by a freshet at Concord, and finally, after long hesitation, floated up stream!

Mrs. Ward's career promises to reverse this order of development. She began with a capital of thought, and of experience turned into thought, which had been accumulated through years of strenuous study and conscientious observation; she had lived in an atmosphere rich in intellectual association and stimulus; she had inherited and she had acquired culture. It was a question, when she began to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

write, whether her gift was greater than the training it had received; whether her native force would assimilate the mass of knowledge and experience with which it had been overlaid. For, to a woman of Mrs. Ward's intellectual resources and training, a really striking novel may be a *tour de force* rather than the natural and inevitable expression of her own personality: in that case, however, the novel will be a tract for the times, but not a genuine work of fiction. And, in spite of its great power of passion and of style, "Robert Elsmere" came perilously near being such a tract. The immense popular vogue which it immediately secured, in spite of the gravity of its theme and the entire absence of all adventitious elements of interest, was a sign that it was a book of the hour rather than of all time; and that its spell lay not so much in enduring qualities of artistic power as in the passionate intensity with which it touched questions that were teasing or tormenting a whole generation. "David Grieve," with serious faults of construction and proportion, was every way stronger and finer as a piece of fiction; indeed, parts of it have the veracity and beauty of the highest art. But "Marcella" marks a long advance in the art of novel-writing, and reveals the dramatic purpose in full command of all the materials of the story, and the dramatic power dealing with them with the ease and freedom which come only with mastery. Mrs. Ward has worked through her culture and found herself; she speaks at last in clear and resonant tones out of the depths of her own nature, and her voice is the voice of an artist by the grace of God as well as by the nurture of the schools.

In "Marcella," as in the earlier stories, Mrs. Ward's task is to dramatize the strife of the soul with its inheritance and its conditions; to give objective reality and force to subjective experience. Her insight into the nature of the dramatic method is clearly seen in the skill and power with which she sets incident and action in breathing contact with the inward struggle and emotion; and the reader is sometimes hurried on with such breathless absorption that he fails to note that his interest is not so much in the movement of the stream as in the images and pictures reflected in it. The human drama has always its inner and invisible stage, and Mrs. Ward's insight and power are shown in the skill with which she compels the imagination to discern the deeper and more decisive drama evidenced, but not fully disclosed, by the drama of incidents and events. Like the passionate woman whose story she tells in this latest novel, "she takes every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing dramatically, imaginatively,—goes straight from it to life, and back again." She makes every step in the vital development of Marcella clear, not so much by description as by the disclosure of the happenings of her outward life. We are concerned from first to last with the question of her fate—for by her temperament Marcella is one of the children of Fate; we are so deeply concerned that only at the end do we realize that we have been reading the story of a soul as well as of a life. The closeness of texture in Mrs. Ward's work reminds one at times of Balzac; but it is the kinship of thoroughness rather than similarity of method which is hinted at. The English novelist never improvises; she lays a foundation of exact knowledge and of painstaking observation under each story. Many readers will pass rapidly over the initial chapters, which describe the girlhood of Marcella, carrying with them into the decisive year of her life only a vague impression of very rapid and effective sketching; but other readers will see in those briefly related experiences a study of adolescence full of intelligence, and bearing with full force on the later revelations of character. In that tumultuous and passionate awakening of a girl's emotions and imagination are distinctly struck all the dominant tones of her nature.

It is certainly no accidental interest in what are called burning questions which drew Mrs. Ward first to the religious question in one of its most widely felt phases; then to the problem of a man's personal life—for David Grieve "knew the perils of his own nature, and there was in him a stern sense of the difficulty of living aright, and the awfulness of the claim made by God and man on the strength and will of the individual;" and now to that social problem which overshadows society and lies on so many hearts not only as an intolerable mystery but as an intolerable burden. Mrs. Ward deals with problems; but her real interest is in the problem of the personal life, and the problems of the hour attract her because they are the momentary phases of the eternal problem. The social problem has not lacked presentation at the hands of the novelists; for the most part utterly inadequate and misleading, because the delicacy and multitude of its relations, not only to the organic structure of society, but to individual lives, have not been recognized. The propagandist, who sees one phase of the problem clearly, and who has an immediate and final solution at hand, cannot write a great novel; for the essence of a great novel which deals with problems is to exhibit character as affected and developed by contact with the question of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hour. In "Marcella" Mrs. Ward presents the question of the day in strict subordination to its influence on the nature and destiny of a girl of brilliant temperament, deep feeling, intense idealism, and noble but impetuous and untrained character. She exhibits the social revolution as it touches a personality of native force and artistic sensitiveness; as it subtly reaches and affects an ancient and interwoven system of social traditions, ideals, opinions, habits, and manners. It is easy to discern the movement in its inevitable pressure at one or two points; but it is a very different matter to discern and trace its contacts with the established order, represented not only by economic laws and methods, but by social instincts wrought into the very fibre of society and playing freely and powerfully through the lives of individuals. It is with these subtler contacts, with this obscure moral process which shapes and determines character, that art legitimately deals; and it is these aspects of the modern problem which are set forth with marvelous vividness and power in the story of Marcella's career.

Mrs. Ward's aim is not to solve the problem, but to state it dramatically in terms of human life; to bring into clear light its relativity. The reformers may measure, if they can, the volume and the velocity of the great wave of change; the novelist follows it as it divides and flows inland through a thousand channels, which carry its current into the very heart of the remotest country-side. The established order has so wrought itself into character that the real difficulties between the social classes are not so much differences of condition as differences of instinct, feeling, standard, and habit. There is no swift solution of the problem, because the moment the reformer touches the matter at any given point he finds not only the specific wrong, but the moral deposit it has made for centuries in the consciousness of individual men and women. When the necessities of the poacher Hurd are met by work adequate and acceptable, the problem in his case is still unsolved; for the instinct for the forbidden sport stirs in him at times with irresistible insistence. In dealing with the social condition we reckon not with the present alone, but also with the past; a past preserved not only in institutions and traditions, but in the thousand obscure tendencies, instincts, and cravings that influence and largely determine the actions of the great mass of men. "Not in mere wealth and property," Marcella came to see, "but in things of quite another order—things of social sympathy and relation—alterable at every turn, even under existing conditions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the human will, lie the real barriers that divide us man from man."

Mrs. Ward has brought the relativity of the social problem into striking relief by the power with which she has set the misery and tumult of the lower half of the world against the repose and culture —the deep, rich culture of centuries of the best influences—of the upper half of the world. Nothing could be more effective than the contrast, never obtruded but always present, between the ripe and opulent life of the English gentleman of rank and wealth, and the rawness, soreness, and restlessness of those whom fortune has disinherited. The poacher, the peasant, the agitator, the labor-leader, the tragic figures who suffer and die in the slums, gain in pathos if not in dignity by the disclosure of those indissoluble ties which make society a unit in its interests and sorrows in spite of its differences of condition. In that interlocking of interests lies the apparently insoluble element in the problem, but in it is found also its deep and passionate dramatic interest. The eager young girl, bearing in her own heart the anguish of her little world, and of the larger world so far as she knows it, breaks into fiery revolt against the established order, and flings herself into the struggle as if a single rushing charge would crowd the old wrongs into the sea. But that close personal contact reveals the immensity of the problem and brings out its moral elements; the fundamental differences are seen to be in character; and while institutions must be changed in order that character may be changed, the slowness and complexity of the process becomes at first a new anguish to the sacrificial temper of the girl. Her interest and zeal do not perish in the tremendous personal experience through which she passes; but she learns that civilization is greater than any special form which it wears either for good or evil, and that, while the cry of the wronged for redress loses no urgency of appeal, the ultimate issues of life are not in conditions but in character:

> "She had ceased to take a system cut and dried from the Venturists, or any one else; she had ceased to think of whole classes of civilized society with abhorrence and contempt; and there had dawned in her that temper which is in truth implied in all the more majestic conceptions of the State—the temper that regards the main institutions of every great civilization, whether it be property, or law, or religious custom, as necessarily, in some degree, divine and sacred. For man has not been their sole artificer!"

But this deeper insight into the moral processes out of which institutions grow, and to which they must conform, while it brings

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

calmer temper and increase of patience, brings also a diviner devotion and hopefulness; and Marcella vows —

—"within the limits of her personal scope and power, never to give up the struggle for a nobler human fellowship, the lifelong toil to understand, the passionate effort to bring honor and independence and joy to those who have them not."

So many words about the problem with which the story deals must not be suffered to convey the impression that "Marcella" is only another social study; it is dramatic in the deepest sense from beginning to end, and more than once its dramatic movement rises to a great height. There are passages and scenes in it which, in force and intensity, come very near the greatest things in English fiction. Indeed, the special quality of the story is the passion which vibrates through it; a passion for truth, a passion of sympathy, and, at the end, a passion of love. The narrative is full of strongly drawn figures; men who live in their emotions no less than in their convictions and interests, and whose processes of thought are disclosed with a force and reality that constantly recall the masters of the novel. A splendid veracity runs through "Marcella" and gives it a kind of nobleness possessed only by books that are born out of full knowledge and yearning sympathy; knowledge that will see and know the worst, and sympathy that is inspired rather than chilled by the knowledge of the worst. Mrs. Ward has learned how to hold her material in subjection to her artistic purpose, but she has lost nothing of that passionate seeking for truth, and that immense and tender pity for those who, having found it, must needs pierce their hearts with it, which gave her earlier novels their immediate and pressing interest. She is a realist to the very heart in her absorption in life; but, having found the human fact, she is all eagerness to understand its moral significance and to find its place in the spiritual order. There is a touch of divine compassionateness in her brooding care for the human soul, however stained and broken; and we recognize in her, as in George Eliot, one of those great natures whose largeness of vision does not break the closer ties with common humanity, but becomes only another name for pity and love. But this vision does not rest finally on the miseries to which it ministers; it discerns the wider order, the higher hope. "Sitting beside the dead son," she —

—"wrapped the mother in her arms, and the only words that even her wild spirit could find wherewith to sustain this woman through the moments of her hus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

band's death were words of prayer—the old shuddering cries wherewith the human soul from the beginning has thrown itself on that awful encompassing Life whence it issued and whither it returns."

But at the end of her rich and vital experience Marcella —

—"thought with mingled smiles and tears of her plans for this bit of earth that fate had brought under her hand; she pledged herself to every man, woman, and child in it so to live her life that each of theirs should be the richer for it; she set out, so far as in her lay, to 'choose equality.' And beyond Mellor, in the great changing world of social speculation and endeavor, she prayed always for the open mind, the listening heart."

HAMILTON W. MABIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED